

ordination to the priesthood. Not more than three or four priests in the whole history of the archdiocese were ever privileged to celebrate a like event.

On June 6, 1939, at a celebration in honor of his diamond jubilee, President Roosevelt wrote him this letter:

My DEAR MONSIGNOR LAVELLE: Please allow me the pleasure of joining with others of your myriad friends in extending heartfelt congratulations on the happy occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of your priesthood.

What a long life of varied good works yours has been, and how remarkable that your entire ministry of threescore years all has been with the great cathedral church to which you were assigned after you received the holy orders in 1879.

As the devoted pastor of a large and important congregation who has also been active in the cause of education and civic betterment and ever sympathetic to the cry of the poor and friendless, your long life has been rounded out in manifold activities in behalf of God and country and your fellow men.

I am glad to know that you enjoy such a measure of good health, and I hope that your remaining years may be many. Particularly I congratulate you on possessing that rare zest for life and work which has carried you well past the fourscore mark, young in all save years.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT.

In addition to this splendid tribute from the President of the United States, Monsignor Lavelle received scores of tributes from other prominent citizens. I shall mention only a few: His Excellency Archbishop Francis J. Spellman; Gov. Herbert H. Lehman; former Gov. Alfred E. Smith; and Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia. One of the principal speakers at the Jubilee Dinner, given at the Hotel Commodore in New York City, was Postmaster General James A. Farley, and during his address, Mr. Farley said:

Monsignor Lavelle, with that rare vision given to few, must have foreseen what was coming, for his whole life has exemplified that cooperative service which in the last decade has become so prevalent among the influential men and women of America, whether they be churchmen, industrialists, labor leaders, or public servants. He, in the distant past, was a pioneer in a field where now he numbers as coworkers many who were not born until long after his labors began. It has been his good fortune to see the struggle of a few hardy souls become the pattern for the many. He as a young man took part in the prologue of the drama that now, in its last act, is approaching the happy ending. May God spare him, so that in the epilogue he may actively be part of the successful culmination, the attainment of which will have been due to the efforts of such unselfish and tireless workers as has been this man of Christ, Monsignor Lavelle.

A purse containing a large sum of money was presented to him on this occasion. But, characteristically, Monsignor Lavelle, before accepting it, insisted that it be used only for his personal charities. This purse represented offerings from the humble citizens of his old neighborhood as well as from the most affluent citizens of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this holy man knew that his end was approaching and recently wrote to Archbishop Spellman asking him to "offer up a fervent prayer to our good God that He may be merciful to me." A humble request from a humble soul. My colleagues, the following incident, which I quote from the statement made last night by Archbishop Spellman, is typical of the character of Monsignor Lavelle:

A few days ago when, at his request, I gave an absolution and a blessing, I told him that it was my intention to have his mortal remains placed in a crypt at St. Patrick's Cathedral. He smiled with joy and with gratitude when I said that I did not feel I was creating too much of a precedent in bestowing this distinction on one who had given 60 years of his priestly service in the mother church of the archdiocese of New York.

In spite of his long priestly service in the great cathedral church of St. Patrick and of the many honors that had been conferred upon him by three of the Supreme Pontiffs, he gave a final demonstration of his humble character by a smile of gratitude at the news that he was to be so singly honored by burial within the walls of the cathedral to which he gave his life in the service of God. Time may dim our memory of him, but while the walls of St. Patrick's stand, his name will be, as the phrase goes, "Ad perpetuam rei memoriam."

He has gone to his reward having fought a good fight. From high and low, from far and near, tributes are coming, and will continue to come, sent by men and women of all religions expressing their sorrow at his passing. The sorrow of the city of New York at the passing of Monsignor Lavelle is deep and finds expression in the editorials of our press.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial from the Somerset Daily American.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 19, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII,

Mr. McDOWELL introduced a resolution (H. Res. 316) authorizing the appointment of a special committee to study various United States statutes, which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5804. By Mr. DURHAM: Petition of 400 citizens from Greensboro, N. C., concerning neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5805. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of sundry citizens of Plymouth, Ind., and vicinity, and members of Local Union No. B-9, International Brotherhood Electrical Workers, urging the strict neutrality of this country and retention of the present arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5806. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of residents of Elk County, Pa., protesting against any revision of the existing Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5807. Also, petition of sundry residents of Franklin, Pa., and Oil City, Pa., asking retention of present Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5808. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Mrs. John P. Rice, secretary, Fairview Grange, No. 446, Chester, W. Va., urging that we do all we can to keep the United States neutral and to guard against sending our young men to the battlefields of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5809. By Mr. VREELAND: Resolution by the New York Board of Trade, expressing the hope that out of the debates and conferences in the Congress now assembled there will come an act that, while it may forbid the carriage by ships of American registry of items enumerated in the present Neutrality Act, will otherwise conform to international law and keep our country neutral without setting up artificial and impractical barriers that will cut off this country from trade intercourse with much of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5810. Also, statement of the Maritime Association of the port of New York, regarding the effect of the proposed Neutrality Act on American commerce and shipping; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5811. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Legion, Macon, Ga., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the establishment of a token of peace and union as set forth in the plan of the Andersonville Memorial Association; to the Committee on the Library.

#### SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who hast created us in Thine own image and hast revealed unto us the perfection of Thy nature and Thy purpose in the manhood of Thine

only begotten Son: Bless, we pray Thee, the leaders of the nations of the world, that they may seek justice and find Thy law; that they may seek peace and find Thy plan; that they may seek brotherhood and find Thy fatherly love. Send forth among all men the spirit of good will proclaimed by angels unto shepherds on the plains of Bethlehem when divinity was cradled in humanity, that those who have been offended may forgive, and that those who have offended may repent, so that all Thy children may live together as one family and may worship Thee, Thou source of beauty, Thou giver of law, Thou strength of love, our Father and our God. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, October 18, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	King	Russell
Andrews	Donahay	La Follette	Schwartz
Austin	Downey	Lee	Schwellenbach
Bailey	Ellender	Lodge	Sheppard
Bankhead	Frazier	Lucas	Shipstead
Barbour	George	Lundeen	Slattery
Barkley	Gerry	McCarran	Smathers
Bilbo	Gibson	McKellar	Stewart
Borah	Gillette	McNary	Taft
Bridges	Green	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Guffey	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Gurney	Minton	Townsend
Burke	Hale	Murray	Truman
Byrd	Harrison	Neely	Tydings
Byrnes	Hatch	Norris	Vandenberg
Capper	Hayden	Nye	Van Nuys
Caraway	Herring	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Chandler	Hill	Overton	Wheeler
Chavez	Holman	Pepper	White
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pittman	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Radcliffe	
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### PETITION AND MEMORIAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Edith Rogers, Tallahassee, Fla., praying for repeal of the existing embargo on the export of arms and munitions of war, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a memorial from members of the faculty of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., remonstrating against participation by the United States in the present European conflict, suggesting certain amendments to pending neutrality legislation, and favoring the proposals to keep American ships and citizens out of danger zones, and also that the Congress remain in session throughout the prevailing crisis, which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. WHEELER introduced a bill (S. 2989) to extend the time granting preference right of entry to veterans, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

#### NEUTRALITY AND PEACE OF THE UNITED STATES—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J.

Res. 306), Neutrality Act of 1939, which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

#### SELECTION OF CENSUS EMPLOYEES FROM CIVIL-SERVICE LIST

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the Senate a letter from Robert L. Johnson, president of the National Civil Service Reform League, which was made public a day or two ago.

In that letter it is urged upon President Roosevelt that he follow the precedent of that other illustrious Roosevelt, President Theodore Roosevelt, who in 1910 urged the Director of the Census to seek the cooperation of the Civil Service Commission in the selection of supervisors, assistant supervisors, enumerators, and other Census Bureau field-force employees.

It was only a few weeks ago that President Roosevelt, very properly, urged that political partisanship be laid aside during the present crisis. It seems to me it would be only fair that the laying aside of partisanship should be extended to the appointment of Census Bureau employees. The public interest will be much better served, in my judgment, if Census Bureau employees are selected on the basis of ability as certified by the Civil Service Commission than on the basis of party service as certified by political-party leaders.

I ask unanimous consent that the contents of the letter from Mr. Johnson, president of the National Civil Service Reform League, to President Roosevelt be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The National Civil Service Reform League has continuously urged that the appointment of supervisors, assistant supervisors, special agents, enumerators, and other employees of the field force of the decennial census be made in accordance with the civil-service rules.

We understand that the eligible registers of the Civil Service Commission contain the names of several hundred thousand persons who might be available for service as enumerators in various localities throughout the country, and might also be readily employed in providing properly equipped candidates for appointment to the supervisory and other posts. All of these positions are of a class whose qualifications, experience has shown, can be readily determined through the Commission's examinations.

It would, of course, be most unfortunate if the great work of taking the 1940 census were to be handicapped through the appointment of any considerable number of employees deficient either in mental equipment or personal reliability. Yet such has been the almost invariable result of relying upon political sources of recommendation for appointment to public work of the sort in question. Particularly has this been so in the taking of some of the preceding Federal and State censuses.

We submit that the pressure ordinarily to be expected from Members of Congress and local political leaders alone, bent upon securing the appointment of their followers or dependents to the hundred thousand or more positions to be filled, must be greater than any public official can stand. It would seem to us that aside from the other weighty considerations involved the Director of the Census, charged with a public work of transcendent importance, should not, in fairness, be subjected to such a handicap.

For these reasons we very earnestly suggest that following the precedent established by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1910, you urge upon the Director of the Census that he seek the cooperation of the Civil Service Commission to the furthest degree possible as the selection of the supervisors, assistant supervisors, enumerators, and other employees of the field force proceeds.

#### ADDRESS BY ADMIRAL LAND ON THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the American Merchant Marine, delivered by Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, retired, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, at the American Merchant Marine Conference, Hotel Waldorf Astoria, New York, on October 10, 1939; which appears in the Appendix.]

#### CELEBRATION IN HONOR OF SENATOR WHEELER AT HUDSON, MASS.

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Mr. D. B. Robertson, president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, entitled "Wheeling with Wheeler on Wheeler Day," published in the Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen's Magazine of the issue of October 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. BYRNES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Canada and the United States," from the column Today and Tomorrow, written by Walter Lippmann, which appears in the Appendix.]



## TRADE WITH LATIN AMERICA

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of October 13, 1939, entitled "Too Great Expectations," which appears in the Appendix.]

## THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE TO THE STOCKHOLM CONFERENCE

Mr. McCARRAN obtained the floor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in complete cooperation with 20 other American republics, the United States has officially notified the conference of four Nordic states at Stockholm of our deeply sympathetic interest in the undeclared independence and neutrality of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and particularly Finland. As a neutral ourselves, I think we have a perfect right thus to assert our emphatic good wishes to other neutrals when they gather to defend their status. I applaud the message which President Roosevelt yesterday sent to the Stockholm Conference through the King of Sweden. I am sure it bespeaks the overwhelming sentiment of Congress and the country and this entire western world. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The conference of the Nordic States convened by Your Majesty in Stockholm will be followed with deep interest by the Government and people of the United States.

Under the circumstances which exist, this Government joins with the governments of the other American republics in expressing its support of the principles of neutrality and order under law, for which the nations represented at the Stockholm Conference have, throughout their history, taken a consistent stand.

## SUBMARINES IN THE CARIBBEAN

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if I may, I should like to make one further request. For the reassurance of the American people, I should like to quote from the Philadelphia Record of yesterday, as follows:

Yesterday Lt. Comdr. S. B. Cooke, commanding the United States Patrol Squadron 51, said that "a continuous search of the whole eastern Caribbean area had failed to reveal the presence of a single submarine of a foreign power."

## NEUTRALITY AND PEACE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), Neutrality Act of 1939.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in addressing the Senate today, I do so from the standpoint of one who has listened with rapt attention to every speech on this subject that has been made on the floor of the Senate. When I say "rapt attention," I mean that I have been engrossed in the arguments presented on the issues pending here today. A nation lives, civilization lives, humanity will live, and religion will persist upon an orderly arrangement of human affairs.

When I say "an orderly arrangement of human affairs," I might with propriety look to the Author of all religion, the Author of all civilization, the Author of everything that is worth while in the world; and so, if I deal today rather briefly with some views that are based upon training in the law, with some views that are based upon experience with the law, and with some views that are based upon interpretation of the law, I trust I shall not be considered overly academic.

Mr. President, there has been presented to the people of this country, by the call of the Chief Executive, a problem, a question that involves not only this Nation, with its one hundred and thirty or more million people, but the entire course of civilization for centuries to come. A nation lives by its integrity. The integrity of this Nation is being judged today in the court of human conscience throughout the length and breadth of the civilized world. The integrity of this Nation is based upon its own concept of its own law, enacted by itself at a time when there were no trials, when there were no dissuading influences, when there was nothing to divert us from the course of justice.

Let us review from a legalistic standpoint, if you please, the history of the problem which is before us today. Some

may say that it grew out of the legislation of 1935. I would go back just a little further; I would go back to 1934, to the first meeting of the Senate Special Committee Investigating the Munitions Industry. From this investigation were brought forth the essential things that stand behind the all-important problem now before us.

If I were to pay a compliment here I would pay it without regard to party lines, because, in this matter, there are no party delineations. The Chief Executive has called for that. The world is calling for it. Humanity is craving for it. I speak of my beloved colleague, the son of one of the greatest men America ever produced, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], and my equally beloved colleague on the other side of the aisle, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYPE], and their associates on this special committee. One is the descendant of a great Democratic line, the other the descendant of a great Republican line. So there is no politics in this question from the very roots up, but do not lose sight of the fact that the investigation of munitions was the very nucleus out of which this whole question grew.

Out of that investigation, which has given to America a chapter of history which no historian can afford to overlook—a chapter written into print by order of this body—there grew the act of 1935. What was the Neutrality Act of 1935? The Neutrality Act of 1935 was one in which, for the first time in the history of this country, we saw fit as a nation to say that while we had been preaching peace to the world, we would practice peace to the world by writing into our statutory enactments lines that would let the world know we meant our preaching.

We wrote the first embargo of arms, munitions, and implements of war. We wrote the first embargo, as I have said, following a long investigation, which had resulted in widespread consideration and observation. The people of this country had an opportunity to know what the munitions investigation was; and out of the thought of the people, out of the thought of the body of this country, there came the Embargo Act of 1935.

Mr. President, that we may understand what is meant by the embargo and what is meant by cash and carry, I hope, during the course of my discussion, to make plain the differentiation, because the idea has been broadcast in this country, it has been put out by a propaganda so insidious and so far-flung that the average man on the street now believes it, that we cannot have an embargo on munitions of war and cash and carry on other than munitions of war in the same measure, in the same bill, in the same act, in the same law. How fallacious, how unworthy, is that propaganda!

Oh, press of America, where do you stand on this all-important question? Press of America, that molds and guides the destiny of mankind within the confines of a great democracy, arise to the situation now, because it is within your power to set aside and clarify an error that your writers, and those who speak over the air, have poured into the ears and into the minds of the people of this country. Tell them the truth of the matter. Explain to them that we can have an embargo on death-dealing instrumentalities of war and cash and carry in the same measure.

"Cash and carry" is a chain-store phrase. Cash and carry came out of the mind of someone who sought to sell his view quickly to a public who read only the headlines. So cash and carry came from the idea "Pick and pay and pack"; "Come and get it, but pay on the counter before you leave with the package."

Mr. President, it is not an inapt expression; it has much in it that is very worth while. Personally I support the general idea, if it be an idea cogently and emphatically expressed in law, that cash and carry is worth while as it affects other than those things which destroy, per se, human life.

Let us again return to 1935. The first Embargo Act of this country was written in 1935. That was the first time this great Nation departed from the law of nations; that was the first time this country departed from international law, because, generally speaking, under international law any nation could carry anything to a nation at war if it could get by.

We sought, for a certain purpose, to pull our country out of the category of furnishing destructive instrumentalities to countries at war by saying that we would not supply them at all. That law was enacted in August 1935. We were confronted with a then-approaching war, a foreign war. I say it was then approaching, because, while we enacted the law in August 1935, the Italian-Abyssinian War broke out in October of that year. It was then in the offing. We sought to be neutral in fact as well as in declaration of principle.

We sought more than that; we sought to make certain that nothing should so involve us as a nation as that we would be drawn into a war where one country was on the Mediterranean and the other was in East Africa. We sought to deal fairly, but we sought something more, to announce to the world on the first occasion when we had the opportunity to announce it our contribution to the peace of the world, our contribution to that which we had prayed for, preached for, and for which we had sent forth our emissaries.

Mr. President, it was not once that we enacted that law. We went through the period of the Abyssinian War with that enactment on the books. Then, in 1936, the whole question rose again before the American people. Mind you, the American people are, after all, the great rank and file, the great strata of humanity for whom we, as representatives, speak.

Be that as it may, returning to what we did and to what we are going to do; who called for the act of 1935, who enacted it, who approved it? What was it? The act of 1935 was an absolute embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war. The act of 1935, for the first time in the history of this country, and I think for the first time in the history of nations, was a notice to the world that the greatest producing people on the face of the earth would not lend their efforts to producing the things which would destroy human life in time of war; that those who saw fit to go into war must furnish the implements of war; that we would not contribute to the cause of death.

Congress passed that law. I think the vote on the floor of the Senate was something like 63 to 6. The President of the United States signed the measure; it became a law by his signature. A man who had gone through one war as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, a man who knew as much about war as anyone in this country or on the earth, a man who knew his country, because he had been Governor of a great State, and President of the United States for some 2 or 3 years, a man who was recognized as the great representative of the lowly rank and file of the people, signed that measure.

He says he is sorry he signed it. Well, the people of this country are not sorry he signed it, the world is not sorry that he signed it, civilization is not sorry that he signed it, because from that signature there will grow history which will perpetuate the expression of the angelic host heralding the birth of the Nazarene when they proclaimed "On earth peace, good will toward men."

It was the first time in all the history of the world when a powerful nation, possessed of everything that would make for war, said, "We will contribute nothing to war, even though we might profit thereby."

In 1935, if I may remind my fellows of the Senate, we were passing through one of the most crucial periods in the history of this country from the standpoint of unemployment, privation, starvation, everything that goes to add to the hardships of humanity. Let it be said to the everlasting credit of the President of the United States, let it go down written in gold under the name of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, that he signed that embargo measure, and that with all his experience, with all his training, with all his worthwhileness, with everything of humanity there is in his whole makeup, he then saw the light, a light that guided him when there were no distracting influences, a light that guided him when there was nothing to swerve him from his course.

Mr. President, he did not regret his act. If for only a moment I could have been adviser to him, I would have stricken from his message the one line wherein he said, "I regret that I signed the measure." He did not regret his act in 1936. I shall read from the speech he made at Chau-

tauqua, in August of that year, when he spoke to the American public. This speech has been read before in Congress, but like the great speech of the first President of the United States, it may be read again and again. It is worth while for the American public to consider it. I quote from the speech of the President of the United States—the man who signed the law of 1935:

The Congress of the United States has given me certain authority to provide safeguards of American neutrality in case of war.

The President of the United States, who, under our Constitution, is vested with primary authority to conduct our international relations, thus has been given new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality.

Are we going to disarm the man who, before his Chautauqua audience, envisioned new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality? Are we going to say here by a vote of Congress, "Those weapons which you so loved and admired, whose potency you extolled before the Chautauqua audience, the Congress of the United States is to take from you"? Let that never be said, because it was the man who I hope will go down into historic immortality, the man who today stands at the helm of this Government to guide it through a war-torn world—it was Franklin Delano Roosevelt who gave utterance to the hope that those weapons would not be taken from him. He was pleading then that those weapons given to him by the Congress should not be taken from him, because by using them he could guide his Nation, which he so much loves, through the dangerous waters he viewed ahead.

Let me proceed with the words of the President of the United States:

Nevertheless—and I speak from long experience—

Oh, how I have sought to dwell upon that expression. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy during the Wilson administration, The Assistant Secretary of the Navy at the time the world was moving toward a cataclysm of war the like of which it never had known before, well might utter those words, "From long experience" I speak to my people. I continue to read:

Nevertheless—and I speak from long experience—the effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State.

We seek to have him retain in his possession today that which the people gave him in 1935, something by which he, together with his Secretary of State, may maintain at peace a Nation which is not involved in war, a land not torn by war confusion, a country whose Chief Executive may say to the world: "I will be the accepted arbiter of the world's disputes."

Would not that be a glorious action to be taken by a glorious man who had signed the first Neutrality Act, the first step toward world peace? Would not that be a crowning glory which would rest upon his brow, if, when his second administration had closed, he could, with the laurels of the world upon him, retire to a peaceful home, secure in the knowledge that his was the guiding hand toward a great world peace? Would it not be a thousand times better that the President, for whom we have every respect, the man who wanted this weapon of declared neutrality so that he might hold his country at peace with the world—would it not be better that he should retire in glory, a glory resulting from his having been the very harbinger, as well as apostle, of a peace that would be lasting and might perchance solve that problem which for over a thousand years had failed of solution, namely, the disputes and conflicts of Europe that 360 wars in 700 years could not settle?

Mr. President, I now turn to a thought that has welled up in my heart from the time I attained my maturity. I turn to that thought in the light of the expressions made by the President of the United States at Chautauqua in 1936, when he said:

It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would, in the event of a war on some other continent, reduce war profits, which would otherwise accrue to American citizens. Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men. For the Nation as a whole it produces disaster.



I am referring to labor—the red blood of our country. If there be an element in all the country that represents the strength of our Nation, it is the workers. While I have no commission to speak for labor, I speak for them out of a life of experience devoted to their cause. If during my short stay in the Senate of the United States I have spoken for anything, for any element, for any cross section of human life in this country, I have spoken for the workers. For 7 years I have willingly borne the brunt of their battles on the floor of the Senate. Today I take to myself, without any sanction or authority, the right to speak for the lowly and the humble, and when I do I will use their own words, which I shall read in just a moment.

Does labor want to repeal the arms embargo? Do the rank and file, the toilers, of this country want the repeal of the arms embargo? I will tell you—and I will take their word in writing for it—that they want nothing done that will for a moment even tend to lead this country into war.

The repeal of the arms embargo is the first step toward war. Of that I have no doubt, because the embargo so far maintained has not involved us in the European conflict. We have gone through two complete wars, and are now going through the third war. In none of the completed wars have we become involved. We went through the Italian-Abysinian War with this law on our statute books.

We went through the civil war in Spain, which, while it was called a civil war, was in reality a little world war. In neither of those two conflicts did we become involved at all, because we had set our foot down as a nation; we had declared to the world that we would not contribute to the destruction of human life in foreign conflicts. We, as the great progressive Nation of the world, have written a new line in the history of progress.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REED in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. With reference to the situation in Spain, the embargo law was already in existence; and in order to take care of civil strife, in which Spain was fighting not a foreign enemy but her own people, recommendations were made to the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which I happened to be a member at that time, and we amended the embargo law in order to take care of a ship in New York which was about to take arms and ammunition to one of the contending sides.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am very grateful to the able Senator from New Mexico for his contribution to my thought. I am very grateful because it fits in exactly with the history which I sought to outline.

The President signed the 1935 act. It went before the American public and received the great American sanction.

Mr. President, what is an American sanction? What is the sanction of 130,000,000 human beings occupying a vantage point on the face of the globe? What is the sanction of 130,000,000 human beings who have gone through the vicissitudes of war to gain their own position, and then looked on? Yea, more than looked on. They lent the flower of their manhood, the flower of their national existence, to carry out, as they thought at the time, the possibility of perpetuating democracy on the face of the earth.

We did not go into the World War for gain. We did not go into it for territory. We did not go into it for monetary aggrandizement. We did not go into it to get anything out of it, save and except to give to the world that for which we had striven through almost a century and a half, that which we loved, that which was ours, that which we thought was worth while as a rule of human conduct to guide men to a destiny in which they might so develop themselves in this transitory existence as to be worth while in the cycles yet to come.

I read on from the expressions of the President of the United States in his Chautauqua speech:

It was the prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry and a price level

so high that the normal relationship between debtor and creditor was destroyed.

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent—

As it has broken out today—

let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

Let me pause in order that we may think why we are here. Why is Congress called in extraordinary session? Are there somewhere, somehow, those who, seeking the fool's gold which the President mentions, want to break down or take from our great peace President the arms with which he said Congress had furnished him? Are there those in the world today—perhaps in our own land, perhaps abroad—who seek to say:

"Mr. President, we admired your Chautauqua speech. It was right. You were armed by Congress with the things that would hold your Nation out of the involvements of war. But fool's gold is leading us on. That which you call fool's gold is inspiring us to say to you, 'Take away your arms. Walk out into the avenues and the alleys of life, where you will be bludgeoned by those who are now conducting a war for supremacy abroad, a war for the control of the balance of power in Europe.'"

The balance of power in the Western Hemisphere is all that the Western Hemisphere is concerned with. The balance of power in Western Hemisphere is a balance of power that has, as its balancing agency, peace.

Mr. President, I speak of peace so often that someone might accuse me of being a pacifist. However, my first name would indicate that I am not a pacifist. I am reminded of a little incident. Some very good women were discussing over the teacups their respective family trees. There was a good old Irish woman sitting there who said nothing during the discussion. Finally one of the ladies turned to her and said, "Well, Mrs. Finnigan, what did the Finnigans spring from?" She said, "I would have you know that the Finnigans never sprang from anybody. They always spring at them." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, no one will ever accuse me of being a pacifist. When the time comes that my Nation demands the greatest army we can produce to defend its rights as a nation; when the time comes that my Nation demands the greatest Navy afloat on the waters of the world, I shall be the first one to vote for that defense. When the time comes that this Nation must carry its principle forward against a foreign foe, no one will ever accuse me of being a pacifist.

But, Mr. President, there is always lingering in the hearts of humanity the hope that the day and the hour will come when war will be a thing relegated to the past, when men will see the light of reason, and, seeing the light of reason, will see to it that there is no mass murder in the world.

Mr. President, let me continue to read the expression of my President, your President, the Chief Executive, who now asks for a repeal of the arms embargo:

They would tell you—

Those who seek the fool's gold—

and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other articles to belligerent nations the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations, that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts.

They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world.

It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond—to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

If we face the choice—

Says the President of the United States, the present President of the United States, who signed the 1935 Embargo Act—

If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—"We choose peace!" It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of public opinion in this country that the answer will be clear and, for all practical purposes, unanimous.

Mr. President, that is what we are working for. We are working to make the language of the President of the United States a talisman for the welfare of this country in the ages yet to come. It may be that we are only a minority, but let that minority go down in history, although it may mean the sealing of our political doom, as having spoken and emphasized the expression of the President of the United States, whom we love and respect. Let it be said that we never deserted him even at his own request. Let it be said that we reminded him of the thought he expressed in the solemn moment when he was placing before the American people the tender of his candidacy for reelection to the Presidency of the United States in 1936.

Mr. President, some time ago I made mention of the fact that if there was anything by way of inspiration in my life it was the inspiration to do something for those who toil. So I convey this thought in every expression I utter: The toilers of America want to keep out of war. The workers of America do not want again to be brought into the cataclysm of war. Why? Who lends most to the fire of war? Who gives most to the fearful carnage of war? Whose sons go first into the front-line trenches? The sons of the workers, the sons of the lowly and the humble who have no power or influence to hold them back.

They are the first to feel the crash of the shrapnel; they are the first to endure the effects of the hellish gas; and they are the last to come out of the maelstrom. They are the first as well as the last to die, and many of them die by inches. Oh, let us go down to Fort Whipple, in Arizona; let us go to any one of the many hospitals in this country and view the victims of the last war, who have not even had the privilege of dying, but who have lingered in suffering and bodily torment for the last 20 years. Now, day by day, their names are written off the list. They were the sons of the rank and file of this country. So labor does not want to contribute any more to the hellish fires of war; it does not want to send from its hearths those who are near and dear to it.

I advert to the expression of my able colleague from Connecticut when I say it is the sons of every one of us who will go to war, of those who oppose and of those who favor the repeal of the embargo, because pride will prevent any of them from joining the number of those who would ask a favor of their country. So they will go into the front-line ranks together with the workers' boys, together with the sons of American homes who are contributing to the maintenance of those homes.

So, I repeat, labor does not want to go even into the atmosphere of war.

May I now read—I hope with propriety—an excerpt from a great speech by a great man, one of the able leaders of the great rank and file of this country. I quote the words of William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in April 1939 when he said:

The American Federation of Labor has endorsed the principles upon which the Neutrality Act was based—

That was the Neutrality Act that carried with it and now carries with it the embargo on munitions of war—

that a neutral nation has obligations as well as rights and that the munitions industry is a matter of public concern. We do not believe that this is the time to make changes in this law, for any change in this legislation might be interpreted as a change in our foreign policy.

We believe that the present neutrality law has served the interests of peace between nations and that it should be continued as it was enacted in 1937.

Then I again turn to the expression of Mr. Green, wherein, in May 1939, he said:

In the present difficult international situation, strong pressure has been behind a proposal to increase the President's authority and responsibility under the Neutrality Act. The purpose is to make possible quick and efficient action in crises. To follow this course is to adopt the procedure of foreign countries and to abandon the safeguards of our traditional democracy without assuring peace in the world.

There must be no European entanglements and no involvement in European wars. We call upon our Government scrupulously to avoid the commission of any overt act, to maintain a strict neutral

attitude, and thus avoid the tragic and unhappy experiences through which our people passed during the great World War. Men and women who this day are observing labor's holiday throughout the length and breadth of our land crave peace; they pray for peace; they strive for it, and are determined to maintain it here.

Well might the president of the American Federation of Labor have used those expressions, because practical experience led him to do so.

The President of the United States, in his message of September 21, made reference to that which might come out of giving employment in the way of an industry that would produce munitions of war. We went through that experience from 1914 until 1918, through the exigencies of the unfortunate war into which we were drawn by agencies which are now revealed, as we look back, as most pernicious agencies. Through that period we passed. Did labor profit by it? Let us see.

The increase to the wage of labor during that period—and I refer now to the period when we sold munitions of war to the warring nations abroad, not to the period during which we were in the war—approximately 24 percent over the normal, while the increase in the cost of living during that period—and I now again refer to the period before we entered the war—was approximately 42 percent. So labor gained nothing by that unwarranted increase as payment for its toil. While the labor of America was working in the fields and in the factories, working here to produce things that would destroy life abroad, and men were getting increased wages thereby, every laborer in America knew that he was creating engines of destruction for boys abroad that he would hate to have created by the labor of some other country to destroy his own boys.

Labor is not dense to justice. The man who labors is not oblivious to the idea that the same wife to whom he returns for the evening meal, to sit at his table and see his boys there, the same home that he supports by his toil, may be exemplified in a home somewhere over there. Yea, a thousand times those in the homes abroad sit down to a more meager meal than his; but the heartbeats of humanity are just as great abroad as they are here. The call for honorable national justice is just as sacred there as it is here.

Mr. President, who calls for the repeal of this act? Let it not be for a moment thought by the American public that this was one act, passed at one session of the Congress, that had no more consideration than that which would be given at one session of the Congress.

In 1936 we again passed an act embargoing, if you please, arms, ammunition, and implements of war. Nowhere in 1935 did we embargo the essentials of life; but in 1935 and again in 1936 we embargoed arms, ammunition, and implements of war. Again the American people, again the Congress of the United States, again the President of the United States, were called upon to consider that all-important matter; namely, embargoing, keeping within our own confines, keeping away from warring nations, either then at war or threatened with war, the things that would destroy life, the things that per se were the instruments of hate, because every shell that comes through the air, every bomb that drops from the sky, every torpedo that passes through the water, carries with it a message of hate and implants hatred, regardless of the brand it may bear as to its creation.

We were seeking then in 1935 and again in 1936, not to implant in any nation a spirit of hate, because we were at peace with the world, but again to implant the spirit of peace; again by precept and example to say to the world that we had been, and then were, intent upon being a peaceful people and a peaceful nation. We said to other nations, "We will lead the way, because at the mouth of our greatest harbor there stands the form of a woman holding in her hand a torch that spells 'Liberty'; and liberty is the hand-maid of peace in any land, in any country, anywhere. Only peace can produce individual human liberty."

So in 1936 this body and the body on the other side of this building again brought to the attention of America the fact that as a nation we proposed to refuse to sell armaments of



war, munitions and implements of war, to any foreign belligerent, but that we would sell to them the things that would feed and clothe them. We would let them have, without embargo, corn, wheat, and cotton. We would supply them with that which spelled something for their industry, that they might be turned from the awful avenue of war, and see that industry, after all, was worth while; that they might take the pieces of platinum, and the tubes of brass, and the bales of cotton, and turn them into industrial avenues so that the glory of industry and the glory of God might be builded on a finer thing than the destruction of human life.

That was our second great contribution to the peace of the world. We were not at all blushing over the fact that we had declared to the world something that international law did not recognize, something that belonged to us. We were not saying to the nations of the world in 1935, "You must follow our example; we will declare war on you if you do not." We were only saying to the masses of the world and to our own people, "This is the way of peace. This is the way of national progress. This is the way to build a nation so that the historians of ages yet to come may write our name as the first harbinger of peace that would last, because we refused to send the implements of war to destroy the sons of the mothers of any country."

Mr. President, that was our second great venture along the road to unrivaled position for the peace of the world. Did we pause there? Not at all. In 1937 we again dealt with the subject. You Senators who do me the honor to listen today participated with your votes, with your speeches, with your thoughts, with your energy, with everything there was. In 1937 we again enacted, we again carried into our law—what? Repeal of the arms embargo? Not at all; a continuation of the arms embargo, again notifying the civilized world that America was intent upon carrying out that of which America was the initial founder; namely, the exemplification of peace by refusing to sell to belligerent nations that which would destroy life and continue the war in belligerent countries.

We did more than that. In 1937 we enacted the first statute which could be tabbed as "cash and carry." But we provided that it should expire May 1, 1939. Again, on May 1, 1939, or thereabouts, we took up the consideration of this all-important question of embargo.

Mr. President, this was the American people speaking through their Congress, not alone to the American public but to the world. This was the fourth time between 1935 and the present year that we, as the American Congress, representatives of a great people, saw fit to say to the world whether or not we meant what we had enacted in 1935. The House of Representatives, through its Committee on Foreign Affairs, brought in a joint resolution which eliminated the embargo on munitions of war and there was written into that measure on the floor of the House the embargo provision.

The House of Representatives, that great body which speaks for the people, of the people, and by the people, wrote into the measure, by a vote on the floor of the House, the embargo provision. That was known as the Bloom bill. It was the fourth time we had dealt with the subject; it was the fourth time we had announced to the world our policy; it was the fourth time that the world looked on and said, "America means what it says."

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. We now hear that the subject of the pending measure, which the Senator is so ably discussing, has been considered four times, and it has been discovered now that it does not help England; and Senators have stated on the floor of the Senate that we have to help Great Britain and this measure does not do that; that therefore we should repeal the arms embargo. It seems to me that that sort of a statement on the part of high officials lacks a certain note of Americanism which ought to be present.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am grateful to the Senator from Minnesota for his thought. I think it is cogent; I think it is loaded with much very effective argument; that it is a very effective expression. I hope to touch on it later.

Mr. President, I do not speak for labor, but only of labor; not that I have any authority or commission but only that there has run down the years of my existence and become interwoven in the heartstrings of my life a ribbon of sympathy with the toilers of America which I hope will never be removed. I hope there will never be taken from me the only crown I ever hope to wear, namely, the consciousness that in every act and thought and deed of mine I have sought to elevate the condition of the toiler in the United States, and more, the condition of the toiler in all the world.

So I again turn to labor as it speaks for itself in a national conclave. I wish to read what was said by labor, sitting in the city of Cincinnati only a few days since. Before that conclave was everything that had been said in this debate up to that hour. Labor, the toilers of the United States, seeking to keep us out of war, seeking to keep peace in this country, mindful of the fact that they had passed through a war, mindful of the fact that during the time between our participation in that war and now their sons had grown from babyhood, if you please, to an age where they would be called upon to go into war if war comes today, said:

The experience of recent years has emphasized the wisdom of the advice given to our country by our first and great President, George Washington, in his Farewell Address. Already policies are being advocated which, on the surface, seem to be neutral and fully justified, but which, if approved, would lead our Nation to take those first steps which, when taken, would of necessity lead to others which, in turn, would so commit our national policy as to irresistibly and irretrievably force us into war.

Should we enter the European conflict, or should our country by any action indicate its official support of some of the warring countries, we could not help but become allied with them—an alliance which we would not then be free to sever during the period of the war or afterward.

This shows the vision of those men who represent the rank and file of labor. They know that if we tear down the neutral bars which now keep us from the conflict of war we have taken the first step toward war, and the first step is only a leader for the second step, and the second step means—and I say it without any idea that I am merely being oratorical, because that is the last thought in my whole being—the second step means a declaration of war. May God forbid.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield for that purpose?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	King	Russell
Andrews	Donahey	La Follette	Schwartz
Austin	Downey	Lee	Schwellenbach
Bailey	Ellender	Lodge	Sheppard
Bankhead	Frazier	Lucas	Shipstead
Barbour	George	Lundeen	Slatery
Barkley	Gerry	McCarran	Smathers
Bilbo	Gibson	McKellar	Stewart
Borah	Gillette	McNary	Taft
Bridges	Green	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Guffey	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Gurney	Minton	Townsend
Burke	Hale	Murray	Truman
Byrd	Harrison	Neely	Tydings
Byrnes	Hatch	Norris	Vandenberg
Capper	Hayden	Nye	Van Nuys
Caraway	Herring	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Chandler	Hill	Overton	Wheeler
Chavez	Holman	Pepper	White
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pittman	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Radcliffe	
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, who fostered, who prompted, and who advocated the present embargo law? Was it labor, was it the rank and file of the people of this country, was it anyone save and except those who finally enacted the law? Who fostered the present act prohibiting the sale of munitions of war? Who promoted the act of 1935? Who extolled that act after it was promoted?

Mr. President, there is no one for whom I have more respect than my colleague [Mr. PITTMAN], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. His 26 years in the Senate of the United States, his wide experience as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, his splendid ability, prompt me to listen to him when he speaks on the subject of international law and the relationship of this country with the sisterhood of nations of the world. And so when I read his language, when I revert to his expressions, I do so with the most profound respect and admiration.

Following the enactment of the embargo on munitions of war by the Congress in 1936 my honored colleague [Mr. PITTMAN], the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, in an article which appeared in the magazine *Today* of February 1, 1936, said:

I have had the opportunity to read some severe criticisms of the proposed act. In none of these criticisms have I discovered any opposition to the embargo upon arms, ammunition, and implements of war. In fact, most of these critics approve such embargo.

It is charged that the bill aids the strong and penalizes the weak. Any exports to belligerent countries during a war must have this effect. The belligerent, or belligerents, having control of the seas will prevent any exports reaching the belligerents weaker upon the sea. How do we injure the weaker, therefore, by permitting fewer exports to all of the belligerents? We sympathize with the weak, but it is better for us that they suffer than that our citizens be dragged into war unnecessarily. We are seeking primarily to keep our citizens out of war, and in this effort we cannot be deterred by the effect of our domestic action upon any belligerent. The act provides that we must treat all belligerents alike. Nothing could be more neutral.

If I had any inspiration in the world, it would be the inspiration of the experience of my worthy colleague, who for 26 years has represented my State in the Senate of the United States; who for 23 years has been a member of the Foreign Relations Committee; who for 23 years has been in the very forefront of legislation dealing with the relationship of this country with foreign countries. In his next declaration after the enactment of the 1935 act he said with cogency that no one dared challenge our neutrality position by reason of the embargo, because, he said, "We are seeking primarily to keep our citizens out of war."

The act of 1935 was not an act which amended international law. The act of 1935 was not something which affected the relationship of nations on the high seas. The act of 1935 was an ordinance passed by the legislative body of this country to guide the conduct of our own citizens with regard to war in foreign countries. As stated by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], it was to keep our citizens out of war. If it was to keep our citizens out of war in 1936, what about our citizens being dragged into war in 1939? Are conditions in 1939 any different from those of 1936?

Let me analyze the situation from a world standpoint. In 1936 Italy was at war with a country in eastern Africa, so we enacted a law which affected both Italy and Abyssinia. Italy could pay cash and could carry, because Italy had the money and the ships with which to carry. Abyssinia could neither carry nor pay; and yet we enacted the law to stay out of a conflict far from our borders. There were no great cries in that war, because we were not involved. There was nothing save and except the one outstanding proposition that should be paramount as an issue today, namely, keeping this Nation out of war.

So my honorable colleague, with all his experience, with all his training, with all his worthwhileness, with all the splendid attributes which have caused my State to send him to the Senate term after term, was the first to say that our Neutrality Act, whereby we embargoed and refused to sell armaments of war to warring nations abroad, was one of the finest things we had ever enacted.

Let me read another expression from my colleague, showing that he was not at all blushing over his first expression. He stated on the floor of the Senate on January 6, 1937:

What I should like to do, so far as arms and ammunition and munitions of war are concerned—

He was dealing with the very thing that is the heart of the pending measure—

would be to starve them both out so they would not have an airplane to drop a bomb on women, children, and the nonbelligerent population, so they would not have a shell to put into a rifle to shoot at long distance and kill innocent people, so they would not have a bomb to blow up buildings with noncombatants in them. I would starve them both out, as far as weapons are concerned, and that is my object so far as we can possibly accomplish it.

That was the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate of the United States, speaking on the floor of the Senate, striving for that which he, as chairman of that committee, had accomplished by the great act of embargoing anything that would destroy life.

But he was not alone. He was not the only one who sanctioned the law which it is now sought to set aside. Mr. Cordell Hull, the present Secretary of State of the United States, a man for whose opinion the world listens, speaking before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate of the United States and giving to them his unbiased opinion to guide the legislation which was then pending before that committee, said on January 10, 1936:

We cannot step out and say, "Americans have a right to go into the harbors at Naples or Genoa and trade indiscriminately."

We have no right to say that we may contribute to those things that tend to the destruction of humanity abroad.

Mr. President, those were two great authors. One was the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the other was the Secretary of State.

But that was not all. There is in this body, sitting by my side from day to day, a man whose very name is a talisman in the intermountain country of America. He is the very epitome of educated citizenry in this country. For years he has taught in one of the great universities of the intermountain country. If you were to name him in that country as "Senator THOMAS" you would be asked, "Do you mean Professor THOMAS?" He is loved, respected, and revered. He is recognized as one of the outstanding authorities in all the world on international law and international affairs. So I call upon him now to bear witness.

In an address in Washington, D. C., on March 25, 1939—mark the date—dealing with a phase of this question that is all important, he said:

The cash-and-carry suggestion is unmoral. It rewards the belligerent with the largest purse, as often as not the aggressor nation.

It serves notice to the world that this Nation is a cash-and-carry store and nothing else as far as others are concerned.

Founded in commercialism, it is not better than the dollar diplomacy which characterized our nineteenth century history and our demand of rights as a neutral which carried into the war of 1917.

To set up a system of buying at all is a recognition of the false assumption that wars are good for business. It has everything wrong with it, not the least of which is the invitation to transfer the theater of war into our harbors and onto our piers, where foreign ships come to load our goods and pay at the dock or the warehouse.

Mr. President, I listened with rapt attention the other day to the expression of my colleague, the able Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], when he sought to correct certain misinterpretations and misconstructions of remarks made by him. I waited to hear if he might say that he had been misquoted in the speech to which I have referred, but never did I hear a word by way of correction. That is his speech, and it means exactly what it says, for, in truth, if we become the salesmen of engines of destruction to countries abroad, we will bring the theater of war to our own piers. The Senator from Utah, the greatest authority on international law in all western America—and I dub him such without fear of contradiction—a man who is revered by every boy and girl who ever attended his classes, whom every follower of international law respects, said, "we would bring the theater of war to our piers."

Was Professor THOMAS correct in that statement?

Witness the disasters that took place during the period between 1914 and 1917. Here is a partial list of the fires and



explosions that occurred in munitions plants in the United States when we were not in war but when we were furnishing the instrumentalities of war to warring countries, as a result of which some of our industrial institutions were destroyed and many of our people were killed:

January 1, 1915: Incendiary fire at the John A. Roebling Co. plant at Trenton. This was about the beginning of a long series of mysterious, unexplained, incendiary fires and explosions in properties where supplies for the Allies were being manufactured.

March 5, 1915: Explosion at Du Pont plant at Haskell, N. J.

April 1, 1915: Explosion of Equitable powder plant at Alton, Ill.

May 3, 1915: Explosion at the Anderson Chemical Co. at Wallington, N. J., costing three lives.

May 10, 1915: Explosion in Du Pont plant at Carneys Point, N. J.

May 15, 1915: Two explosions occurred at the Du Pont plant, Carneys Point, N. J.

May 30, 1915: Explosion in Seattle Harbor of dynamite manufactured at Pinole, Calif., which was then located on a barge in Seattle Harbor. The German consul and vice consuls in San Francisco were indicted and convicted in connection with this matter.

June 26, 1915: Incendiary fire at the Aetna powder plant at Pittsburgh.

July 7, 1915: Incendiary explosion at the Du Pont plant at Pompton Lakes.

July 16, 1915: Incendiary explosion and fire at the Aetna plant at Sinnamahoning, Pa., causing five casualties.

July 19, 1915: Incendiary explosion at the Du Pont plant at Wilmington.

July 28, 1915: Mysterious explosion at the Du Pont works in Wilmington.

July 29, 1915: Mysterious destruction of a glaze mill in the American Powder Co. at Acton, Mass.

August 29, 1915: Explosion in Du Pont plant at Wilmington, Del.

October 1915: A mysterious fire destroyed shops of the Bethlehem Steel Co.

November 10, 1915: Mysterious fire at Bethlehem at the Bethlehem Steel Co., of which all Germany had had warning and on which the German press were forbidden to comment.

January 10, 1916: Explosion in the Du Pont powder plant at Carneys Point, N. J.

January 11, 1916: Explosion at Du Pont plant in Wilmington, Del.

January 15, 1916: Explosion in the Du Pont plant at Gibbstown, N. J.

February 12, 1916: Bethlehem projectile plant destroyed.

April 13, 1916: Du Pont plant at Bluefield, W. Va., wrecked by an explosion.

May 10, 1916: The Atlas powder-mixing plant was destroyed.

May 16, 1916: The Du Pont Powder Co. plant at Gibbstown was mysteriously destroyed.

May 1916: A large chemical plant in Cadillac, Mich., was mysteriously destroyed.

June 7, 1916: Du Pont plant at Wayne, N. J., destroyed.

July 22, 1916: Explosion in Hercules powder works.

December 9, 1916: The Midvale Chemical Co. building at Bayway was destroyed by a fire and explosion.

December 27, 1916: The Bethlehem Steel Co. gas plant was destroyed by an explosion.

In passing I may say that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] had back of him a diligent and studious life, a life devoted to teaching the youth of America, and that teaching had sunk in so deep that when he uttered that expression there were men in this country who had grown from boys out of his classrooms, who said: "We will not let down the embargo." Now, I wonder after his great speech of March 25, 1939, what intervening agency caused that learned professor of history, that profound professor of international law, that great man, experienced in all the trials and dangers

of war, to change his views. There must have been cogent, persuasive argument to bring about such a change.

Who else was there in America who supported the embargo? Who else placed the brand of approbation upon the principle that we should not sell destructive agencies to be sent abroad to destroy the sons of foreign mothers?

Who else besides the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, the professor of international law; the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]—who else? The American people. Throughout the length and breadth of this land, from ocean to ocean, from the Canadian line to the Gulf, they endorsed the proposition. There was not a single expression against it, as stated by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations in the excerpt from his speech I have just read.

Who calls for the repeal of the embargo? What clarion voice is ringing out from the West, from the East, from the South, or from the North? Whence comes the call for repeal?

Is America, with all her statesmen, with all her thinkers, with all her teachers, and all her people who have taken their stand on this question, now going to repeal the embargo law?

Does it come from the boys of America? Does it come—let me ask the Senator from Connecticut—from his boys? He made mention of splendid boys whom I admire, but the boys of every Senator who stands on the opposite side of this question he did not see fit to mention. He did not mention my boy, or the boys of other Senators who oppose repeal. It would have been fair of him had he said: "There are boys on the other side of this question whose fathers are fighting to keep them away from foreign battlefields." Some of us have not so many, but where we have but one the love which might be dispersed among several is centered in him. Where we have one, we see him grow, we love him, we live in him, and we battle for the same cause; we look to the same result. Is it the boys of America who want the embargo repealed? Let us see to that.

Mr. President, it is not the men who would go to the trenches who want the embargo repealed. It is not the boy of from 18 to 25 or from 18 to 30 who wants the embargo repealed. He has no quarrel with a foreign country. He only looks into the chalice of life and drinks deep, aye, even to the dregs, because he loves life. He is not afraid to defend his country when the hour comes, but he does not propose to involve himself in a quarrel in which he has no concern. So the youth of America is not calling for the repeal of the embargo; the youth of America does not want to destroy boys abroad. They want to put an end to war.

If I may come back to the thought of Mr. Secretary Hull:

The more we lend ourselves to giving or selling or furnishing to warring nations that which continues war, the more we jeopardize our own national existence and bring ourselves to the brink of war.

That is, in effect, the statement of Secretary Hull given before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

So, I repeat, the boys of America do not want the embargo repealed. Look about everywhere and we can see them today praying that some agency in the legislative body of this country will hold the helm and steer such a course that their lives may be made worth while; so that they may give to their nation the best they have in them, that the greatest nation in the world may go forward in peace and tranquillity. No; it is not the boys of America who want us to raise the embargo.

Is it the people of the country? Is it the rank and file of the country that want the Congress of the United States to raise the embargo? Let me remind you of the four great sessions through which we passed—1935, 1936, 1937, 1939—in every one of which the Congress of the United States carried forward the embargo provisions. They may have relinquished in other lines, but never did the Congress of the United States relinquish the embargo, because the people of the country were behind the embargo, and they are behind it today if they understand it.

Let me refer again to the misunderstanding that is being broadcast. By insidious and undermining propaganda in this

country today there is being peddled to the people of the country the thought that we cannot have an embargo on munitions of war and have cash and carry in the same measure.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Has the Senator the slightest doubt that that impression, which has been carried by every propaganda agency the country has ever seen, is a deliberate attempt to mislead the American public?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no doubt of it. If I were to hold the Senate into a period in which I might be accused of filibustering, I could bring before it indisputable evidence of the propaganda that is going forward in the country, one phase of which, if you please, is to cause the people of the country to believe that we cannot have embargo on munitions of war and cash and carry for nonmunitions of war in the same bill.

Let me define the issues between the group of which I have the honor of being one member—whether they be many or few makes but little difference; history will record us among those who were determined, even in a minority—and the group on the other side. The issue between the contending groups on the floor of the Senate may be stated, I think, with clarity. We stand for the sale of nonmunitions of war, providing those who buy will pay for them at the dock and carry them away in their own bottoms. We stand for keeping American nationals off belligerent vessels, because when a citizen of the United States goes on a belligerent vessel he wraps about him the flag of his country. He says, "I am protected by 130,000,000 people, and you dare not sink the vessel I am on."

That is a fallacious position, because 130,000,000 lives are in jeopardy every time an American citizen boards a belligerent vessel. Better a thousand times that he forego the pleasures or the adventure or the exigencies of business and go on other than a belligerent vessel, if need be, than to take with him the lives of his countrymen when he goes down by reason of a torpedo that may sink the belligerent ship.

We stand for keeping American-flag ships out of the combat zones. We do not believe that an American-flag ship plying in civil trade, even though under the law of nations it might be permissible, should even for a moment jeopardize the country whose flag it flies at its masthead. We stand for these things written into a bill in which it is provided that the engines and instrumentalities of war shall not be sold at all to belligerent nations.

That is our message to the world. That is the word that was published here by a member of the group to which I belong and to which I adhere. That is the word given out to the Americas and to the world by the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], representing the group which refused to adhere to the repeal of the embargo. Write into this joint resolution everything you desire that will fortify our keeping out of war; and, if you do, you will write again, as you wrote four times before, the embargo provision with regard to munitions of war and implements which are in themselves, per se, instrumentalities of destruction.

Could any issue be more clearly stated?

I read in the press last night that the Committee on Foreign Relations is about to promulgate and bring before the Senate amendments to the pending joint resolution. If I read the report aright, there is not one of the proposed amendments—if the terse statements of them in the press are correct—that I would not support, providing they go along with the all-important embargo on means for the destruction of human life abroad. I would keep American citizens off belligerent vessels. I would do it although in doing it I know my country might dip its flag; but it would dip its flag in the honor and glory of carrying on the great movement for the peace of the world. Yes; I would go ahead and say, "We will keep our citizens off belligerent ships, where, under the law of nations, they have a perfect right to ride."

We will do that in order that when you are through with your hellish war abroad, when you are through destroying yourselves, when the dogs of war have been chained and muzzled again, and the nations once more are looking for someone to guide them into the haven of peace, they may find that in keeping with our traditions and in keeping with our declarations to the world we will say, "We stood for neutrality. We stood for peace. We did not augment your fury in war. Now, if it be that you seek some one to be an arbiter of your troubles, come to the haven and we will do justice by you, as we have done in the past."

Mr. President, this is not a partisan controversy. This is not a controversy that has political lines. This is a controversy in which men may deal fairly and honestly, regardless of political lines, so that one great principle may be everlastingly uppermost and everlastingly perpetuated; namely, that America, having maintained a strict neutrality; America, having refused to lend itself to the furies of war; America, bent on peace; America, with the soul of its youth in its heart; America, with a realization that labor, after all, must live in peace—America today sends a message to the world, as we sent it to the world in 1935, as we sent it to the world in 1936, as we sent it to the world in 1937, as we sent it to the world in 1939: America is resolved that we will not add to the furies of war by selling munitions to anyone outside our own borders.

Mr. President, many thoughts have been expressed here, some that would arouse resentment, some that dealt with history, some that sought to draw the line of justification between particular nations. I do not deal with that subject. I have no respect for Mr. Hitler; I have no respect for totalitarian governments in any form whatever; neither have I respect for those, abroad or at home, who deal in atrocities, even in war. But, Mr. President, there are no comparisons here. I can hear the song of the martyrs who went down in the cause of freedom for a little island, and I can hear the song of those who died in other lands.

I see Mary Queen of Scots dying in a dungeon at the mandate of the ruling queenly monarch of her beloved country. I see martyrs standing on the gallows uttering to the world the defiant lines:

Whether on the gallows high  
Or on the battlefields we die,  
What matter if for Erin dear  
We fall?

I see the firing squad with its beads aimed at the breast of Edith Cavell, and I see the fagots that gave forth the flame that enwrapped the saintly body of Joan of Arc. I see the firing squads that purged out the lives of the enemies of Hitler, and I see Mme. de Farge as she counted her 23 stitches, at the end of which another head dropped from the guillotine into the basket.

So there is nothing gained by comparison. We do not deal with comparison as a test of ability. It is remote from our consideration. There is only one thought here, and that thought is America, the mothers of America, the boys of America, the men who toil in America. Let us not take the first step that would lead them into war, and there is no doubt that if we tear down the embargo provisions of the law we will have taken the first step.

Mr. President, I hope I may deal with propriety on something in which I have had experience; that is, the construction and application of law as it is written. We declared to the world, we declared it by our highest authority in 1915, in conjunction with the highest authority of other lands, that to change our position on neutrality in the midst of a war abroad would be an unneutral act, and contrary to the law of nations. Let no one deny that; let no one question it.

This very question arose, conversely, if you please, during the World War. On that occasion Germany sought to have us impose an embargo. Whether as a result of German influence, or as a result of other influence, I think rather by the inspiration of great patriotism, Senator Hitchcock, of Nebraska, than whom no greater ever sat in this body, introduced and sought to have passed a joint resolution to put an end to the shipment of munitions of war to belligerent nations.



That measure was before the Senate for consideration. A note from our Secretary of State to Ambassador Page, then Ambassador from this country to the Court of St. James, stated in substance that he had had a conversation with Lord Gray, in which conversation the British authority questioned our right to change our attitude during the course of the war, and said that such action would be an unneutral act.

The German Ambassador brought the question to the then Secretary of State, Mr. William Jennings Bryan, and the Secretary of State, in answer to the query, made this statement:

This Government holds, as I believe Your Excellency is aware, and as it is constrained to hold in view of the present indisputable doctrines of accepted international law, that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality by which it has consistently sought to direct its actions, and I respectfully submit that none of the circumstances urged in Your Excellency's memorandum alters the principle involved. The placing of an embargo on the trade in arms at the present time would constitute such a change and be a direct violation of the neutrality of the United States. It will, I feel assured, be clear to Your Excellency that, holding this view and considering itself in honor bound by it, it is out of the question for this Government to consider such a course.

Mr. President, we were announcing the law of neutrality to the nations of the world through the voice of William Jennings Bryan, our Secretary of State. We did not hesitate then to say what the law of nations was. We did not hesitate then to say that, notwithstanding the fact that there might be an advantage gained by one or the other of the belligerent powers, we would not lend ourselves to a change during the course of the war, because it would violate what we then respected, the law of nations. There is not a judge in the United States, there is not a thoughtful man or woman in this country, who would contradict the logic that was written into the lines of William Jennings Bryan. The world has listened; the world is not dense in these matters. The world looks upon us for leadership, and where will leadership come save and except from our authorized leaders?

Certainly our Secretary of State was then an honored and respected man, as he is now in memory, happy memory, if you please, an honored and respected representative of this Government, and a leader who could speak for America.

Mr. President, has there been a change? It is said now that, notwithstanding the fact that on four occasions we announced to the world as our policy that we would not sell the destructive instrumentalities of war to any nation at war, we should now change our policy, and, notwithstanding the doctrine of Mr. Bryan, notwithstanding the doctrine of that beloved leader of democracy, Woodrow Wilson, notwithstanding every word that has come down the ages, should change our policy now.

Why are people not candid? I admire the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], and I admire his candor. I admire the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and I admire his candor. He wants to aid one side of this foreign controversy. I do not know that I could attribute any such expression to my able colleague. If I did, I would gladly do so. But I admire his candor, and would admire his candor more if he would say, as the able Senator from Nebraska said over the radio and otherwise, as the able Senator from Vermont has said, that they want to help one side of this controversy.

Mr. President, I do not want to extend aid to either side of this controversy. I want to keep American boys at home, because when we aid one side of the controversy by letting down the bars and permitting the sale of engines of war, we only let down bars which cannot be put up again, and after the engines of war there must come the manipulators of the engines of war.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. Does not the Senator agree that at the present time we are aiding one side to the controversy by leaving the embargo in force?

Mr. McCARRAN. If I were to agree to that I would say that by letting the embargo down we would aid the other side. I would rather a dozen times aid neither side. When we adopted this policy we adopted it in the cool of a nonwar period, when we were seeking to eliminate the very possibility of what now confronts us.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am prompted to ask a question for the reason that just a moment ago an inquiry was directed by the Senator from Nebraska to the Senator from Nevada as to whether or not it was true that we are now aiding one side or the other. I understood in the beginning of the debate that we, Members of the Senate, were here for the purpose of considering neutrality. I understood that we were here for the purpose of passing a law that would be neutral, insofar as we were concerned, between those nations which are at war in continental Europe. I desire to ask the Senator from Nevada as to whether or not I am mistaken when I say that during the debate there has been developed, not the question of neutrality but the question of whether we will help the Allies or whether we will be neutral?

With the Senator's permission, I wish to repeat a statement I made on the floor of the Senate the other day. Insofar as I am concerned I seek that sort of neutrality which will be of benefit to the people of the United States of America, and I care not whether that sort of neutrality is going to suit Great Britain, or France, or Germany, or Russia.

I repeat my question to the Senator: Are we considering the proposition of real neutrality for the benefit of the American people, or has there developed in the consideration of the measure a question of whether or not we will help the Allies?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I guess I shall be here for a couple of hours more to answer that question, but I shall answer as best I can. In 1935 we set out to create a law which would keep America out of war and set up a principle of peace to the world. We set out in 1936 again to enunciate to the world our doctrine of keeping out of war and of keeping peace. Then in 1937 we did likewise, and in 1939 again we did likewise. So my answer to the able Senator from North Carolina must be based on the precept that was handed down from the body of which the Senator from North Carolina is a Member, the precept that was handed down by the President of the United States, the precept that was handed down by the people of the United States when they endorsed the legislation we enacted, to keep America out of foreign entanglements and to keep our agencies for destruction of human lives at home and not send them abroad.

That is the best answer I can make to that question.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLT. Is not the purpose now in mind vastly different from what it was when the legislation was considered previously? We passed the original act in an effort to be neutral. We are now considering this measure in an effort on the part of the proponents to even up. The intent is different. The first intention was neutrality and the present intention is to take sides. So the two occasions are not comparable.

Mr. McCARRAN. I can only answer the able Senator from West Virginia by referring to the remarks of my good friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and my good friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], in which both Senators say which side they wish to win in the matter. That is the only way I can answer it, and I answer the question in that way.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I call the attention of the Senator from Nevada to the very first paragraph of the joint resolution:

That whenever the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states, and that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of the citizens of the United States—

That thereupon he shall make his proclamation, and these restrictions on commerce shall go into effect.

I now ask the Senator from Nevada in all fairness: Should he not recognize that in the position I have taken on the floor here in colloquies, and in the Radio Forum address which I caused to be put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I have clearly stated that my position was that this proposal, this joint resolution here, was a resolution for national defense? I ask the Senator if he does not recognize that my position is primarily that position?

Mr. McCARRAN. I will answer that, of course, in fairness to the Senator, in the affirmative, if the Senator will answer me—I am not a Yankee, by the way—if he will answer me as to whether he has made a statement as to which side in the foreign controversy he wishes to win.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; I have, and I repeat it. As long as I hold the views I have, it is my belief—following the exact language of this joint resolution—

That it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States—

That the Allies win, and that the quicker they win the more quickly will the security be gained.

Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Nevada one further question, and that is: What significance does he give to the present existing law when he reads section 8 thereof, as follows?—

Whenever, during any war in which the United States is neutral, the President shall find that special restrictions placed on the use of the ports and territorial waters of the United States by the submarines or armed merchant vessels of a foreign state will serve to maintain peace between the United States and foreign states, or to protect the commercial interests of the United States and its citizens, or to promote the security of the United States, and shall make proclamation thereof, it shall thereafter be unlawful—

And so forth. My question is, Does not the Senator recognize that the real spirit of that section of the existing law is the same spirit to which I have alluded, namely, that of self-defense, national defense, when applied to a nation?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think I understood the Senator correctly to use the expression "self-defense"?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. National defense.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from Idaho, but I should like to answer the Senator from Vermont first.

Mr. BORAH. Very well; I shall be very glad if the Senator will.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think I could answer the Senator from Vermont best by quoting from language which does not come from my lips. I hope the answer is appropriate to the question, because the Senator knows me well enough to know that I would not be captious. I have in my hand the statement of Secretary Hull, made while testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee, of which I think the able Senator from Vermont is a member.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; Mr. President, I do not have that honor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I apologize to the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; I regard it as a true honor, and I do not think an apology is necessary. I thank the Senator for the compliment, but his assumption is wrong.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the reason why I gave utterance to the expression I did, is that I believe the Senator should have a place on that committee because of his profound knowledge of the law. I base that statement on 7 years of very close association with the Senator from Vermont on the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. A Senator with a mind of his type, a Senator of his character should indeed sit on the Foreign Relations Committee, or any other great committee of the United States Senate. I have a

deep respect, indeed a very profound respect, for his splendid knowledge of the law and of international affairs. In making my remark I did not have in mind at all to be captious. I hope the Senator so understood it.

But may I answer the question in substance by quoting from Secretary Hull in his testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate on January 13, 1936? Remember the date, please, January 13, 1936, when we were then considering a revision of our embargo law which we passed in 1935. Mr. Secretary Hull said:

Now, it did not look wise or reasonable for us to announce a policy that a neutral nation shall supply belligerents with the materials which they say are indispensable to the prosecution of the war under penalty of not being exactly neutral.

To us that seemed absurd, and we said so.

He is referring to the act of 1935, which was the first embargo.

We could not see how a neutral could deliberately help to feed the fires and flames of war by delivering the essential materials right straight to the belligerents, helping not only to carry on war, but to prolong it indefinitely; and nobody knows much better than we that every day that war is prolonged the danger of the war spreading would be increased, with increased dangers to us of becoming involved.

Now, Mr. President, the Senator knows that I would not be captious with him, but I think that that answers the substance and nucleus of the Senator's question briefly.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. If I have properly understood the reading of Mr. Hull's statement, it relates to the question of neutrality. I have not mentioned that question. I think the Senator from Nevada would have difficulty finding any place in the RECORD where I have claimed that the pending joint resolution is strictly a neutrality measure, or where I have ever acknowledged that the act of 1935 and the act of 1937 were strictly neutral.

It has not been necessary for me to express an opinion on that question at all because, in my mind, if our business as legislators is to pass legislation that is a part of the general plan of national defense of the United States, that is supreme over the question of neutrality. National defense cannot be pushed aside on the ground that our acts of necessity would be unneutral. As a dignified nation in the family of nations, we cannot afford to allow two belligerents across the Atlantic Ocean to shackle our freedom to the extent that we cannot pass legislation necessary for our national defense.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator for his contribution to my thought, because I think he commends the very argument I sought to put forward, and that he puts it forward much more forcibly than I could. In his inimitable way he has bolstered my argument, and I am very grateful to him.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] desires to ask a question.

Mr. BORAH. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont a question, but I shall do so later.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada a question. If it be true that the early victory of the so-called Allies is essential to the security and peace of the United States, as I understand the premise of the able Senator from Vermont to be, then if the lifting of our arms embargo fails to produce that victory, are we not still at the mercy of the vicissitudes of Europe; and by the very nature of the argument are we not then forced to go the rest of the way into the war to help produce the victory which is said to be so essential to our security? May not that be the inevitable, irresistible road to our own participation in the war?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, of course the interrogatory of the Senator from Michigan is susceptible of only one answer, and that is in the affirmative, because, as stated by,



the able Senator from Michigan in his speech in the Senate some days ago in quoting from a very outstanding authority of Great Britain, once we let down the bars and open the door, then there is no one to close it, and we must go the whole way. We must then not only go in on the side that we think should win, but if they should lose we must go on and fight their battles to the end. We are in the war when we tear down the embargo. No one can say we have not taken the first step, because every argument leads to the one conclusion—that a change in our policy during a foreign war is the first step. Mr. Bryan said so. Mr. Wilson said so. Mr. Lansing said so. Mr. Gray said so. Mr. Page said so. Mr. John Bassett Moore said so. Is anyone denying that statement?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to add a further observation. If I thought that this was our war; if I thought our peace and security were inherently involved; if I thought it was our war, I would not be satisfied merely to set a cash register at the national boundary and take a profit on the commodities that we can sell to those who are fighting our war for us. I would go all the way into the war with all our power. I do not think it is our war, and I think we should stay all the way out unless we are deliberately and consciously ready to go all the way in.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, with that expression I am entirely in accord.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further comment?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think one of the marked differences in the approach to the problem before us, and the widest cleavage we find between those who favor the joint resolution and those who oppose it, is the assumption which is now made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan; namely, that the citizens of the United States and their representatives in the Congress of the United States are no longer free agents; that they are no longer intelligent; that they no longer are men of character and fidelity; and that they are incapable of putting restrictions and regulations upon commerce which commonly goes free without taking another step and sending our boys across the sea.

That is the grave difference in attitude between us; and it is a difference upon which we will never agree, for I believe that those who favor the joint resolution are as eager and firm in their decision that our boys shall not be sent across the sea to do battle as any group in the United States. What is more, I believe that they have character enough and fidelity enough to truth to carry out that purpose, and that they are not so helpless that they must be dragged in. Dragged in by whom? You cannot have war with us unless you attack us, unless we are willing to declare war—and we are unwilling to declare war. When it comes to a matter of defense, we are not obliged to cross the seas with armed forces to defend ourselves. Our plan does not involve that.

I think we have too long ignored the fact that in the Seventy-sixth Congress the principal business we undertook at the beginning and carried through until it was finished was increasing the Military Establishment of this country for national defense. That was only a part of the plan. We are now considering the remainder.

Mr. VANDENBERG and Mr. BORAH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan. I shall shortly yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to reply to an observation of the Senator from Vermont with respect to what I said.

The able Senator from Vermont, for whom I have the highest respect, totally misapprehends the application of my comment. I am not quarreling with the good faith of his attitude toward keeping America out of war. I am not quarreling with the theory that this Congress still has the

authority within its grip to do what it pleases as subsequent emergencies may develop.

That is not the point. I am contesting the theory that we must help the Allies win in order to be safe ourselves, because on that theory if the lifting of the embargo does not produce an allied victory, we must progressively do more and more as allied necessity may require. I made my statement on the basis of the observation of the distinguished Senator from Vermont that the victory of the Allies is essential to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States and to protect the lives of the citizens of the United States, as quoted by him from the pending measure. I say that if the victory of the Allies is essential to that purpose, and we are unable to achieve that purpose without them, then it is our war, and we dare not be satisfied with merely raising the embargo. If that be true, and the raising of the embargo fails to produce the victory he wishes, then I submit that the very logic of the situation requires us to go further, whether we wish to or not. I complain and object to that point of view and to that trend toward war itself.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the observation of the able Senator from Michigan in answer to the query of the Senator from Vermont is so complete that I shall not take up the time of the Senate to expound or expand it. It is obviously true.

I now yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont stated that he was actuated by the belief that it was to the interest and security of the people of the United States that the Allies win. What does the Senator mean by "win"?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, that is a very broad and relative term. It might be winning if we could arrive at a just peace without any more combat at all. A just peace would be winning. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. BORAH. No; it does not answer my question for this reason: What I wish to know is, what does "win" mean? Does it mean something which satisfies the United States Government or does "win" mean something that will satisfy Great Britain and France?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, it means the stopping of the aggression of the totalitarian philosophy. It means the stopping, for the time being, at least, of the military penetration of the Western Hemisphere. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator mean that the stopping of totalitarian aggression and the wiping out of the Nazi philosophy shall be to the satisfaction of the United States or to the satisfaction of Great Britain and France?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Idaho will pardon the observation, it seems to me that he is far afield from my meaning. He asked for my meaning, and I am undertaking to give it. I have given two meanings of the word "win" that are possible. All this seems to be a polemic about words, as was the discussion by the Senator from Michigan.

It makes little difference whether one uses the word "win" or some other significant verb that indicates that our purpose is either to have an early—and the earlier the better—peace negotiated without further combat, which peace will be just, as nearly as human frailty will permit, or to stop for a time being, at least, the philosophical penetration of our country with ideas that tend to undermine our free institutions and are aimed insidiously at the Republic; or even to prevent the occurrence of incidents which might result in the occupation of Canada or the islands of the Atlantic Ocean near our coast, as well as the occupation of Latin America by totalitarian states having visions of world empire and world grandeur.

Any of those meanings the Senator is welcome to take. They will fit the claim that I make that this country is now engaged, as it has been throughout the Seventy-sixth Congress, in fortifying its material position; that is, its Military Establishment, in endeavoring to fortify its economic position, in endeavoring to set up its sentimental or spiritual

position to resist the onslaught of ideas and of arms. Does that answer the question?

Mr. BORAH. I do not wish to be discourteous but I do not yet understand what the Senator means by "win." [Laughter.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Well, I will have to impute it to the Senator's lack of understanding, I am sure. I am not greatly interested whether anybody understands the word "win" as used by me or not.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hesitate to interfere with the Senators who have recently been conducting the discussion, but I think it might be better if they would continue it in their own time.

Mr. BORAH. I think so myself.

Mr. McCARRAN. I prefer to continue with my discussion.

Suffice it to say, if I may deal with the subject that was brought up by the able Senators, if it be our intention to formulate a law by which we are to aid one or the other side of the controversy abroad, would it not be in accord with the spirit of bravery to say "We are going to go, boots and britches, into this thing; we are going to send our armies across right now; we are not going merely to let down the embargo so that belligerent nations in Europe may get arms with which to commit mass murder."

If that be our real policy, it seems to me that the part of American bravery and the part of American traditions would be to say, "we are going in to stop it now." But that is not our policy. We are not going into this war; we are not going into it by letting down the embargo; we are not going into it by a declaration of war; and I say that just as much for my son as for the wonderful sons of the very able Senator from Vermont, and the wonderful sons of the able Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. President, when the interruption came, I had started to discuss a subject which I think should be concluded. I am trying to reach a conclusion within the time I should consume, because I hope never for a moment to be accused of engaging in filibustering. I think I have told the able leader on many occasions in the past that I am not a filibusterer; I am a "broncho buster" and he knows that; but I want to develop this thought for the few moments it will take me to do so.

I said that Mr. Wilson lent his aid to the thought that was promulgated by Mr. Bryan, and he did it after his attention was aroused by his own then Secretary of State following Mr. Bryan, Mr. Lansing. Secretary Lansing wrote to the President in June 1915, and said:

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In view of the making public of the Austrian statement in regard to the exportation of arms and ammunition, I hasten to send you a draft of reply. \* \* \* I hope you can pass upon it speedily, because I believe it would, at the present moment, have a very beneficial effect on public opinion. It is our first opportunity to present in a popular way the reasons why we should not restrict the exportation of munitions of war. If you have noticed in the papers, meetings are being held under various auspices looking to the imposition of an embargo on arms and ammunition.

Let it be remembered that at that time we had no embargo, and Germany was seeking to have us impose an embargo. It was by reason of the Lansing letter that Mr. Wilson wrote this note to his Secretary of State. This is Mr. Wilson's reply. He said:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have gone over this paper very carefully, indeed, and these questions urged themselves upon me:

1. Can this argument not be taken as an argument in sympathy with the Allies and against the militarism, which is Germany?

2. Are we not ourselves about to urge the control of the manufacture of arms and munitions by every government in our proposed understandings and undertakings with the Latin American countries; and do we not wish ultimately to strive for the same thing in the final European settlement?

Of course, we are arguing only to the special case, and are absolutely unanswerable in our position that these things cannot be done while a war is in progress as against the parties to it; but how far, do you think, the arguments we urge in this paper will estop us in future deliberations on the peace and security of the world?

That was the voice of Woodrow Wilson saying that during the course of a war we could not change our policy if it would interfere with one of the belligerents. Yet that is the very course from which some would now have us depart.

O Mr. President, the honor of America is involved in the pending joint resolution. The honor of America is involved because American recognition of international law is involved under the very voice of Woodrow Wilson, under the voice of Mr. Lansing, under the voice of Mr. Bryan, under the voice of everyone who has ever dealt with this subject.

So, to begin with, if we are to repeal the embargo, if we are to raise the bars and let munitions of war go forward for the destruction of people abroad, we are saying to the world that we are no longer neutral; we have let down the bars so that we will aid. Aid whom? Let me deal with that subject for a moment.

Mr. President, I have no partisanship in the war which is raging in Europe. I may despise one form of government that lends itself to totalitarianism; I may despise another form of government that has laid neighbor nations in devastation, that has shot its victims at the muzzle of cannon; I may despise any of those things; but to despise a form of government is not our national business. It is an individual prerogative but it is not our national business. Other nations may despise democracy, but that does not mean that they would lend themselves to say that democracy should not succeed in a war for its existence.

So we may despise foreign agencies that lend themselves to a form of government to which we cannot and will not subscribe; but the uppermost thought, so far as all American minds are concerned, should not be what form of government other nations or other peoples want, but what form of government do we want. It is the preservation of our form of government that exceeds in importance every other consideration. It is our form of government that has come down for 150 years through trial, through tribulation, through bloodshed, through industry and labor; and the great army of toilers of this country today are crying for the perpetuation of that form of government, because under that form of government labor has had a greater avenue to freedom than it ever had anywhere else in all the history of the world.

So Mr. Green and the other agencies of labor in this country sent forth their resolutions asking us not to take the first step to go into this war, because they will pay the first penalty, and they will pay the last penalty. For every debt that was ever created by a war was paid by a tax, and every dollar that was ever extracted in taxes came from the sweat of the brow of labor. So the toilers of the world do not want this repeal to go forward. So youth does not want it to go forward. So international law condemns its going forward. So America says, "We shall not go forward."

Mr. President, I am about to conclude. In conclusion, I go back to the tenets and teachings of one whose very expressions seem to me to have been prophetic. When I read them I wonder how it could have been possible that, at the very advent of the life of a nation to which he had given so much, he could, there and at that moment, see so far ahead. I often wonder how it could have been possible for a human being, surrounded as he was by foreigners on every hand, by foreign agencies everywhere, to see and understand and lay down precepts and words of guidance such as these.

I have heard it said that if the first President of the United States were alive today he would not utter the advice he gave to his country at that time, because, it is said, that since his day Europe has come so very close to us. We are in instantaneous communication with Europe by wire. We are within a few hours of Europe by air. We are within 5 days of Europe by water. Therefore, it is said, Washington would not have told us that we should remain free from foreign entanglements.

Let us view the situation when, in 1796—nearly 150 years ago—the first President of the United States issued the mandate and the message with which I shall close my remarks. At that time the great Mississippi Valley, from the Gulf of Mexico to Michigan, was under the French flag. France was



the controlling factor in the great central American region. France, with all her power, with all her dominance, with all her instrumentalities, was standing on our western frontier. Then we were only a handful of States.

Beyond, into the great intermountain region and on to the Pacific coast, the flag of Spain was flying. The very land in which I was born was then under the flag of Spain. All of Montana, Idaho, Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, California, and parts of Colorado were under Spanish dominance. The flag of Spain was flying over the capital of Mexico. In every country of South America, save and except Brazil, which was then under Portuguese dominance, the flag of Spain was flying.

Was Washington far from European touch? Was he far remote from European influences? Was there then more than a second's time between him and his western frontier, between him and his southern frontier? And at that time the Canadian border was bristling with arms pointed this way. The Indians of this country were being influenced to fight against the first organizers of this Government.

So Washington, with all the courage of a great American, laid down a message which would do as a closing expression for anyone who sought to hold his country safe from foreign entanglements, who sought to hold the youth of this country free from the dangers of war, who sought to keep the toilers of this country out of the entanglements of war, who sought to hold a nation so that in the ages yet to come it would hold aloft the light of civilization, and say to a bleeding and struggling world, "We are your guiding star," a nation that would hold democracy safe while other nations were being torn down and other forms of government were being destroyed.

May I read this to you? Let us never forget it:

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

Mr. President, with all the conviction I have, based on an experience that has seen the history of this legislation for the past 4 years and more; with all the fervor I have, based on my solicitude for the toiling masses of the country; with all the concern I have that the sons of American mothers shall not become cannon fodder in a cause in which their country is not involved, I say that daily, in place of the prayer so ably uttered here by the Chaplain of this body, that excerpt from the Farewell Address of the first President of the United States should be read, and read again.

Yea, more: I say that every boy in the grammar grades of America should have it read to him every morning when he comes to answer to the roll in his school. Yea, more: I would scatter that sentiment broadcast through the land, so that the embargo that now seeks to keep us at peace, that seeks to keep us out of war, should not be torn down.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that the issues are drawn keenly, carefully, studiously. Let no expression I may

have uttered here this afternoon be construed as attributing to anyone who disagrees with me some ulterior motive. I believe there are on the floor of the Senate 96 men, every one of whom, whether with sons or without sons, are solicitous to keep this country out of war. I shall believe that as long as I live.

But, Mr. President, the method by which we will keep out of war has been tried by the people of this country and by the world at large during wartimes when we have had it under consideration in 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1939. In all of those years the people of this country have looked with approbation upon the embargo. We have sent to the people of the world a notice that we are not going to lend ourselves to the instrumentalities of a war abroad. Wars may have been started with that notice before the peoples who supported them. If that be the case, then there is only one course for us to pursue. It is the course of Woodrow Wilson, it is the course of Lansing, it is the course of Bryan, it is the course of every one who has studied this subject—let us not take the first step. Let us save the sons of American mothers for a greater future, that in the years to come their Nation may show to civilization that, after all, democracy is a success.

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	King	Russell
Andrews	Donahey	La Follette	Schwartz
Austin	Downey	Lee	Schwellenbach
Bailey	Ellender	Lodge	Sheppard
Bankhead	Frazier	Lucas	Shipstead
Barbour	George	Lundeen	Slattery
Barkley	Gerry	McCarran	Smathers
Bilbo	Gibson	McKellar	Stewart
Borah	Gillette	McNary	Taft
Bridges	Green	Malone	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Guffey	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Gurney	Minton	Townsend
Burke	Hale	Murray	Truman
Byrd	Harrison	Neely	Tydings
Byrnes	Hatch	Norris	Vandenberg
Capper	Hayden	Nye	Van Nuys
Caraway	Herring	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Chandler	Hill	Overton	Wheeler
Chavez	Holman	Pepper	White
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pittman	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Radcliffe	
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment which the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and I intend to propose on behalf of the sponsors of the pending joint resolution. The amendment deals with the shipping provisions of the measure.

I may say, if the Senator from Kentucky will yield to me for a moment, that the group sponsoring the amendment had before it the proposed amendments touching this subject submitted by the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and others. This group, consisting of 14 Senators, gave very careful consideration to all the proposed amendments, and I think they have in the proposal now submitted covered the substance of them all. I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table, and that it be printed at this place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed and to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 18, beginning with line 5, strike out through line 20 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(g) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to transportation by American vessels (other than aircraft) of mail, passengers, or any articles or materials (except articles or materials listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of

section 12 (1)) (1) to any port in the Western Hemisphere south of 30° north latitude, or (2) to any port on the Pacific or Indian Oceans, including the China Sea, the Bay of Bengal, and the Arabian Sea; and the provisions of subsection (c) of this section shall not apply to such transportation of mail, personal effects, or any individual on any such vessel, and necessary supplies for any such vessel. The exceptions contained in this subsection shall not apply to any such port which is included within a combat area as defined in section 3 which applies to such vessels.

"(h) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to transportation by aircraft of mail, passengers, or any articles or materials (except articles or materials listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 (1)) (1) to any port in the Western Hemisphere, or (2) to any port on the Pacific or Indian Oceans, including the China Sea, the Bay of Bengal, and the Arabian Sea; and the provisions of subsection (c) of this section shall not apply to such transportation of mail, personal effects of any individual on any such aircraft, and necessary supplies for any such aircraft. The exceptions contained in this subsection shall not apply to any such port which is included within a combat area as defined in section 3 which applies to such aircraft.

"(i) Every American vessel to which the provisions of subsections (g) and (h) apply shall, before departing from a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States, file with the collector of customs of the port of departure, or if there is no such collector at such port then with the nearest collector of customs, an export declaration (1) containing a complete list of all the articles and materials carried as cargo by such vessel, and the names and addresses of the consignees of all such articles and materials, and (2) stating the ports at which such articles and materials are to be unloaded and the ports of call of such vessel. All transportation referred to in subsections (f), (g), and (h) of this section shall be subject to such restrictions, rules, and regulations as the President shall prescribe; but no loss incurred in connection with any transportation excepted under the provisions of subsections (g) and (h) of this section shall be made the basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States."

On page 18, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following new subsection:

"(j) Whenever all proclamations issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked, the provisions of subsections (f), (g), (h), and (i) shall expire."

On page 19, line 4, after the period, insert the following new sentence:

"The combat areas so defined may be made to apply to surface vessels or aircraft, or both."

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I have another amendment to propose, dealing with the pending joint resolution, which I also ask to have printed and lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection the amendment was ordered to be printed and to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 21, line 16, after the period, insert the following new sentence:

"The provisions of this subsection shall also apply to the sale by any person within the United States to any person in a state named in any such proclamation of any articles or materials listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 (1)."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me to ask a question of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is the second amendment offered, which has just been sent forward, an amendment dealing with credits?

Mr. PITTMAN. It is.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask the question because some of us have been preparing to debate that question, and if the amendment may be printed and come to the attention of Senators who are not members of the group referred to, the caucus of the Committee on Foreign Relations, it might save some time in debate.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, that is why I have asked that the amendments be printed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not rise at this time through any capricious or self-centered desire to detain the Senate, but I have felt that at some time during the discussion it would be my duty to express my views regarding the pending neutrality legislation.

I approach the discussion of the joint resolution before us with the deep conviction that we are dealing with a problem which abides not for a day but for a generation or a century or forever.

The action which we shall consummate at the conclusion of these discussions may be more far-reaching than merely to fix our attitude toward the present war in Europe. It may mark a permanent change in the course of our own history, as well as that of the Western Hemisphere, and it may be of the world itself.

In pursuing the course which we shall here take we are not to be influenced by whatever consequences may ensue to Europe or Asia, or, primarily, to the rest of the world, though we are not sufficiently naive to presume that the status or atmosphere in which the world at large strives or struggles will have no bearing or influence upon our own way of life.

Primarily we are charged with the duty of administering to the requirements of our own country. Her prosperity, her safety, her dignity, her self-respect, her strength, her peace are the first objects of our solicitude; and all our obligations, whether within our own borders or throughout the wide expanse of the Western Hemisphere, are inseparably joined to the problem of preserving and perpetuating the form and substance of our democracy as it has been developed and must be developed in the long years and centuries that stretch out through the future.

If we cannot assume this high purpose on the part of ourselves and all others charged with the duty of guiding the destiny of this Republic, then we thereby admit a fatal infirmity in the structure of that democracy of which we boast and for which we fight.

I rise, therefore, Mr. President, to give voice to no suspicions directed at my colleagues in the Senate. I rise to mouth no criticism of any man for his belief or his vote on this question in the past. I rise to make no charge of inconsistency on account of any change of views upon the subject.

I accord to every man not only the right but the profound obligation which I claim for myself to alter or change his course when he finds, or thinks he finds, it headed in the wrong direction.

The proposal which the Committee on Foreign Relations has brought before the Senate is not a proposal to abolish neutrality in the present war or in any war. It is not a proposal to involve us in this war or in any war, though from some of the addresses delivered here during the last 3 weeks one would think we had before us a joint resolution declaring war upon some nation now a belligerent in the present European struggle.

No law was necessary in order to establish the neutrality of the United States. It was the duty of the President at once to declare the neutrality of our Government in this war, which he did, just as it was the duty of Woodrow Wilson in 1914 to declare the neutrality of our Government in the World War, which he did.

The proposal which we are considering, and on which I hope we shall soon vote, is one to regulate the conduct and activities of our citizens in relation to this war or any war so as more certainly to maintain the neutrality which we have declared and minimize the necessity or probability of our entry into the conflict.

The concrete proposition before us is not one to abandon our neutrality and wipe from the statutes all laws regulating it. But what we are attempting now is the fortification of our declared neutrality by further restricting the exercise by our citizens of rights long and universally acknowledged by civilized nations and by the law of nations.

Mr. President, I voted for the so-called Neutrality Act of 1935. I voted for the act of 1936. I voted for the act of 1937, under which we are now operating and under which the present embargo was established by the President.

I am not required to garb myself in sackcloth and ashes on account of that vote, and I do not do so. I am not required to humble myself in the sight of God or man because I was in part responsible for the enactment of the present law.

We all know the circumstances under which it was enacted. We remember the atmosphere which followed certain investigations authorized by the Senate. The world was at peace. There were no war clouds hovering over the horizon. We had proposed and had secured almost universal ratification of the Kellogg-Briand Pact renouncing war as an instrument of national policy. We felt a sort of spiritual resurgence at



the prospect of universal and perpetual peace. We had, almost continuously since the World War, promoted and participated in disarmament conferences, and we wished to give our moral sanction to this concept by announcing to mankind that we were opposed to war and to preparation for war, and that we would not contribute to the prosecution of war, no matter how uneven or unjust, no matter the circumstances of its initiation, no matter its consequences to mankind, by allowing either side to obtain through us the implements of offense or defense. We, in fact, declared our belief in the equal responsibility of both sides and all sides in any possible war that might arise in the future, and that this responsibility was equally diabolical on both sides and on all sides.

I do not deny that Congress had a right to enact such a law.

Like most other Senators, as I have heretofore stated, I voted for it. I did so in the hope that it would discourage wars elsewhere in the world.

Has it done so?

I voted in the hope that our example would be a beacon to guide other nations on the highway of peace.

Has it had any effect on any of them?

Has it discouraged the outbreak of war anywhere?

Has it encouraged it?

Let your own hearts answer in the light of the tragic history of other major continents in the world during the last half decade.

We had the right to enact the present law. We have the right now to change it. I had a right, as you had a right, to vote for it. I did so with many misgivings. I did so with doubts and fears as to its wisdom and workability. I would not say that I voted for it because I did not have the courage of my convictions, but probably it would be more accurate to say that I, like others, voted for it because I did not have the courage of my doubts and fears.

Having voted for it, having watched the course of its present and probable future operation, having reached the conclusion that its continuance is not in the interest of the United States, I intend to vote to repeal it and to substitute for it the measure now under consideration.

I do this on no technical grounds.

I do not contend that the passage of the present law constituted a violation of the principles of neutrality, although its operation gives to one belligerent an artificial advantage which its geographical situation denies to it.

Nor do I agree that the passage of the pending measure will violate the principles of neutrality.

If the original act regulating the conduct and activities of our citizens as to all belligerents was not unneutral, was not a taking of sides, was not what some have called constructive, actual, or prospective intervention, then the change of that law, modifying and extending the regulation of the conduct and activities of our citizens as to all belligerents, is likewise not unneutral.

In other words, the transition from one neutral position to another neutral position by law, as is here proposed, does not constitute a violation of our neutrality so as to justify complaint on the part of any belligerent.

Moreover, if it were true that the present law operates in an unneutral way, the change of that law, or its repeal, or its extension as provided in the pending act, would not constitute a violation of neutrality, even though the new law involves forms of domestic regulation not included in the old.

If both are unneutral, the change from one to the other is not more so. If both are impartial, the change from one to the other does not constitute partiality.

It cannot be contended that we are attempting to change international law. If any single nation could change it, then it would not be international.

What we have done in the existing law and what we propose in the new law is to withhold from certain of our citizens the exercise of certain of their rights under the law of nations sanctioned from time immemorial.

In confirmation of this position I quote from a statement issued to the press by Secretary of State Hull on the 14th of September last:

The Government of the United States has not abandoned any of its rights as a neutral under international law. It has, however, for the time being prescribed, by domestic legislation, certain restrictions for its nationals which have the effect of requiring them to refrain from the exercise of privileges which but for such legislation they would have the right to exercise under international law, such as the right to travel on belligerent vessels, to make loans and extend credits to belligerent governments, et cetera. These restrictive measures do not and cannot constitute a modification of the principles of international law, but, rather, they require nationals of the United States to forego, until the Congress shall decide otherwise, the exercise of certain rights under those principles. Furthermore, this Government gives the widest possible notice to American shipping regarding danger areas as the information is acquired by it. This Government also warns American nationals and American shipping against actual danger in any other respect as situations involving such danger are brought to its attention, whether those situations result from lawful or unlawful activities of the belligerents. It endeavors to exercise all due diligence in the protection of American lives and property and, of course, must expect American nationals likewise to exercise due diligence in keeping clear of danger, actual or potential.

In the letters which I addressed to Senator PITTMAN and Representative BLOOM on May 27, 1939, I stated the situation as follows: "The rights of our nationals under international law may properly be restricted by our own legislation along certain lines for the purpose of avoiding incidents which might involve us in a conflict. In indicating certain restrictions upon the exercise of our rights as a neutral I do not wish to be considered as advocating the abandonment of these or, indeed, of any neutral rights; but there is reasonable ground for restricting at this time the exercise of these rights."

The principles of international law as regards neutrals and belligerents have been evolved through the centuries. While belligerents have frequently departed from these principles on one pretext or another and have endeavored to justify their action on various grounds, the principles still subsist.

This Government, adhering as it does to those principles, reserves all rights of the United States and its nationals under international law and will adopt such measures as may seem most practical and prudent when those rights are violated by any of the belligerents.

Mr. President, if it be true, as Senators have emphasized, that whether we favor the existing law or that now newly proposed, our object is to minimize and, if possible, remove the chance of our becoming involved in this or any foreign war, then wherein lies the difference between the two and their effects?

If as a neutral we are denying to our citizens the exercise of long-established rights in order that we may not have to become a belligerent, by which form of this denial shall we be most likely to accomplish this objective?

If we are all sincere, as I believe we are, whatever side of this question we advocate in desiring the accomplishment of that one thing, then the whole difficulty and controversy boils down practically to the question, Which one of these provisions—that now on the statute books, or that which we are now considering—will be more likely to achieve our objective?

If we are seeking to avoid the repetition of conditions and incidents which drew us into the World War, which of these alternatives, the existing act or the proposed act, will more certainly produce that result?

In order that we may arrive at a conclusion based as nearly as possible upon our history in the past and our probable history in the future, we must consider candidly what it was that drew us into the war in 1917.

I think we may dismiss without serious loss to the validity of this discussion the contention that we were dragged into the war as a result of the profit motive behind the activities of munitions makers, international bankers, or other Americans seeking to coin profits out of the blood of their fellow citizens.

I was in the Congress during those dreadful days. I was serving my first term in the House of Representatives in the administration of Woodrow Wilson. I was a humble and affectionate follower and admirer of the great Speaker of the House at that time, Champ Clark, father of the able senior Senator from Missouri, for whom I have ever since those days cherished the deepest personal regard.

I voted for the declaration of war in 1917, or the resolution acknowledging the state of war already forced upon us by the Imperial German Government. Some of my dearest friends in the House of Representatives, including Claude Kitchin, of North Carolina, the Democratic leader, and others, voted against it.

I shall never forget, Mr. President, the day when the House of Representatives voted following an appealing, patriotic, fervent address delivered on that floor by Claude Kitchin, the Democratic leader. The whole House rose and gave him an unprecedented ovation as a tribute to his sincerity and honesty, though nearly all of the Members intended later to vote on the other side of the question. Some of the most outstanding Members of both branches of Congress voted against it, including our beloved colleague the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

It did not occur to me then that I, or that Congress, or that President Wilson, or anybody in any responsible position in the Government of the United States, was moved on that momentous occasion by the lure of profit, unless the preservation of the lives of American citizens can be chalked up in the profit column in the ledger of human existence.

I need not recount the long story with reference to the efforts made by President Wilson and his administration to keep this Nation out of the World War. I need not emphasize the great ambition of his heart that our Nation should ultimately act as the world's peacemaker, and bring about what he called a "concert of nations" to preserve peace. I need not recount the tragic incidents during 1914, 1915, and 1916, most of which aroused the American people and brought about an accumulation of grievances which resulted in our final entrance into the war.

We are all familiar with the warning given by the German Government on the day before the *Lusitania* sailed from the harbor of New York; and we know that 7 days later this ship was torpedoed by a German submarine and sank within 18 minutes to the bottom of the sea, carrying down with it 124 out of the 129 American citizens on board. This ship did not fly the American flag. The overwhelming majority of its passengers were citizen of other countries; but the sinking of this ship and the loss of American lives precipitated the immediate resentment of our whole Nation, and resulted in a long series of diplomatic notes of protest on the part of our Government and grudging concessions on the part of the German Government. Many outstanding Americans, including Theodore Roosevelt, urged an immediate declaration of war against the German Government following the sinking of the *Lusitania*. I need not repeat the catalog of incidents occurring from the time of the sinking of the *Lusitania* until our declaration of war on April 6, 1917, involving the lives and property of Americans engaged in legitimate business and legitimate travel under all the principles of international law. These details have already been given in the debate, and they are already too fresh in the minds of millions of our people to need any repetition now. President Wilson, in his communications with the German Government, conceded that mere property could be paid for, but stated that human life was beyond the computation of the market place.

Whatever may be the views of international lawyers as to the wisest course that might have been pursued then or might be pursued in the future, and whatever policy may be legally adopted governing our future conduct in attempting to avoid war, the situation from 1914 to 1917 was definitely that the United States, as a great trading nation, had rights and obligations upon which others had come to rely; and to the extent that our country endeavored to restore its own commercial and industrial structure by continuing to engage in legitimate commerce it was entirely justified by the accepted rules of law and of morals.

Let me quote a page or two from the revealing book written by Newton D. Baker entitled "Why We Went to War." Whatever one may think of the economic and political views of Mr. Baker during his later years, however much we may differ from him on some of our economic problems and on the method of our solution of them, I think it is universally conceded that he was one of the greatest Secretaries of War in the history of the United States. No such official in the history of America, if in the history of the world, was compelled in so short a time to mobilize an army of such size, and to mobilize all the resources behind that army, in order that it might speedily and certainly accomplish the purpose of its organization.

Discussing the questions upon which I am now touching, Secretary Baker said:

Now, of course, trade expresses itself in dollars and cents, and dollars and cents are the business of bankers. That is what bankers are for. For the convenience of commerce banks have grown up as mechanisms for the settlement of accounts, and a great technique of operation has been instituted to enable a manufacturer to deal indirectly with his customers through the assistance of checks, drafts, lines of credit, and loans and balances which, while they express themselves on the books of bankers, are in fact the records of transactions in the ordinary trade relations of a people. In this, for the most part, bankers have no other interest than that the use of their facilities and mechanisms make the transactions possible between the primary producer and the ultimate consumer. For the use of his facilities and services the banker is, of course, paid, just as is the transportation agency or the warehouseman or the salesman or the advertiser, and the banker has the same kind of an interest in the promotion of increased trade in order that he may get larger pay for his greater services, as has any of these other instrumentalities which, in their aggregate constitute the mechanism through which trade is carried on. In like fashion international trade consists of exports and imports and for exactly analogous reasons there must needs be bankers with the facilities and knowledge to deal with international financial transactions. The conversion of the value of the currency of one country into the currency of another country, the settlement of international balances the creation and service of international credits, the safeguarding of the exportation of capital for investment, or the handling of foreign capital imported for investment, all require the service of specialists, and international bankers are merely those who train themselves to perform for international trade this indispensable service. The transactions which pass through their books are not their transactions, but the transactions of others who are using their facilities; and so when the volume of international banking transactions is stated in dollars and cents it merely means that producers and consumers have traded with one another over international frontiers and that their transactions are recorded in the books of international bankers who have been one of the facilitating intermediaries who made the exchange possible. Perhaps because of our failure to realize what the banker really is and does we are all too likely to blame bankers as though their transactions represented some peculiarly heartless and detached interest in mere money, when in fact for the most part their facilities have supplied no more than the rails upon which the trains of trade have operated.

I continue the quotation from Mr. Baker:

There has grown up accordingly in very recent years a disposition to charge that bankers and munition makers exerted some sort of pressure upon the Government which affected its policy and ultimately led to our entering the war in 1917.

So far as munition makers are concerned the charge is a singular selection of a particular group out of much larger and quite indiscriminate mass. It is easy to demonstrate that the condition of cotton farmers in the United States was infinitely more a subject of concern and anxiety on the part of the Government, executive and legislative, than the interest or welfare of the munition makers.

I am, perhaps, the hardest person in the United States to impress with the idea that munition makers had any influence upon the American decision. Villa raided our Mexican border just as I went to Washington to become Secretary of War, and my first duty was to arm and equip the Pershing expedition, called "punitive," but in reality defensive, and later to arm and equip the augmented National Guard mobilized on the border. By using obsolete weapons of one kind and another the force was armed, but the Government owned but seven airplanes which could fly far enough to get to Mexico and Captain Foulis—

Who later became the head of the Air Corps of the United States Army—

reported to me that none of them could be safely flown even on missions of local reconnaissance. I then spent months trying to persuade someone to build airplanes for the Army, but the art was then limited to exhibition types in America, and even emergency orders could not be promised under 6 months' delivery, and then only three or four could be expected. Similarly there was but one company in the United States equipped to build heavy machine guns. In a national emergency that company promised to build 70 in a year and to do its best to deliver the first dozen in 6 months.

When we began the actual mobilization of material for our participation in the World War there simply were no American munition makers. General Bliss went to England in January 1918—

Which was 9 months after we had declared war—

and continued an agreement made in June 1917 whereby the British and French supplied us with cannon out of their surpluses in exchange for raw materials.

Nine months after we declared war, and 9 months before the armistice in November 1917, General Bliss went to England to continue the agreement between our country and Great Britain and France to furnish us with the guns necessary for our own Army.

In the early months of the war our manufacture of guns was negligible. We bought in Canada a large supply of Ross rifles, an



obsolete arm, and used the left-overs of the Spanish War, but still gave some of our recruits initial training in the manual of arms with broomsticks.

#### That is the testimony of Secretary of War Baker:

That we were always able to have enough modern rifles for our men overseas was due to the fact that we were able to buy a British-owned factory, built in this country after the World War began, and modified the Enfield, with which the British were armed, to our needs.

We bought revolvers and pistols of every sort, ransacked the museums of city police departments for confiscated "concealed weapons," and we got the best our pistol manufacturers could do under "speed-up production," but at the end of the war we were still short of the required supply.

We went to war 18 months before, because, as is alleged, the munitions makers desired us to go to war, and yet when the war ended we were still short of the munitions that our own Army needed on the battlefields of France.

For months American manufacturers were unable to make heavy ammunition. Some gadgets called "boosters and adapters," necessary parts of high-explosive shells, balked our ingenuity for months until I still think of them as the unattainable but indispensable price of success in war.

We converted typewriter factories into fuze factories and generally converted American industrial plants to the war material nearest their normal product. Somehow we got through—in the opinion of the impatient, none too well. But a munitions industry large enough to be interested, much less influential, in our going to war simply did not exist. During 1917 I never saw a munition maker except as I sent for him and urged him to try to help us in the emergency of our border troubles.

But the whole of American industry and all of the persons engaged in it were necessary and proper objects of governmental concern. The workers in munition industries were merely American citizens earning their living, who in turn were purchasers of commodities grown or manufactured by their fellow citizens. To that extent, no doubt, all sorts of statistical tabulations were made which included them in summaries by which our standard of living was shown and the prosperity or depression of our general economic life determined, but there was no munition industry in the United States in 1914, and by 1917 the industry in that field which had been created here, either by or on behalf of the Allied nations, was merely a part of America's industrial plant diverted from peacetime to wartime production, and the managers of those industrial undertakings could have had no interest in taking the country into the war. To have done so would have been the most shortsighted of policies, for after we went into the war, war profits were reduced to a minimum and excess-profits taxes squeezed the profits out of war with a wringer of constantly increasing efficiency. Upon the plainest terms, the interest of the owners of "war babies" was in keeping our country at peace while they continued to supply the belligerents with their needs upon such terms as they could arrange. The charge against munition makers seem to me largely an unsupported accusation made as an argument in furtherance of a policy by those who believe in the nationalization of all arms manufacture, and the total prohibition of international traffic in arms. \* \* \*

With regard to the alleged influence of bankers I feel obliged to speak under the limitations of a very narrow personal experience. While I was a member of the Cabinet from 1916 to 1921, I do not recall having had a conversation with a banker on any subject, though the strong likelihood is that petty personal concerns were in some way or another filtered through the books of some banks. My complete absence of recollection on that subject extends to conversations with my Cabinet associates and generally with responsible official persons in the Government. I never heard quoted, by any one of them, the opinion of any banker, national or international, that the United States ought to go into the war or that the interests of the United States would be furthered by any suggested line of conduct on the part of our Nation in dealing with either group of belligerents. As a consequence, I am forced to conclude that if any banker sought to exercise pressure in favor of any national policy on the subject, I was for some reason completely excluded and all of my Cabinet associates conspired to keep me in ignorance of the plan.

The record of the bankers on the subject is relatively simple. Prior to the outbreak of the World War, by the settled and accepted principles of international law, it was unneutral for a government to make a loan to a belligerent, but it was at the same time entirely proper for the citizens of a neutral to make such loans if they saw fit. The history of all countries, and notably of our own, was full of belligerent borrowing by the flotation of securities in neutral countries. Early in August 1914, Messrs. J. P. Morgan & Co. inquired of Secretary Bryan whether or not our policy would permit such loans in the European war. To this inquiry Secretary Bryan on August 15, responded by telegram: "There is no reason why loans should not be made to the governments of neutral nations, but in the judgment of this Government, loans by American bankers to any foreign nation which is at war are inconsistent with the true spirit of neutrality" (F. R. S., 1914, p. 580).

The view thus expressed by Mr. Bryan was not a statement of the legal right of citizens of the United States, but was based upon a local and peculiar condition set forth by him in a letter to the President dated August 10, 1914. The proposed loan which raised

the question was sought by France, but Mr. Bryan foresaw similar applications from other countries. Messrs. Morgan & Co. complied with the wish implicit in Secretary Bryan's telegram, but by October 1914 the State Department had more or less retreated to a strictly legal position and small loans were made to both France and Germany. This modification of policy proceeded from a statement of the President to Mr. Lansing that in his view there was a difference between the creation of bank credits for belligerent governments to be used in the purchase of supplies in America and the flotation of a public loan (Maritime Commerce, vol. III, p. 222).

Mr. President, if the legislation which we are attempting, or which has been heretofore attempted, or may hereafter be attempted, is to be effective in avoiding our entrance into this or any foreign war, it must be based on the theory that we are to avoid the causes which led us into the World War, which is thus far the only experience we have undergone in participating in such a foreign war.

By the lamp of this experience we may guide our present and future steps. And the best test of the effectiveness of this or any law, including the existing statute, or that which we are now proposing, is to place the law, existing or proposed, by the side of our past experience and try to visualize its application in the light of the events which actually transpired in the absence of any law in 1917.

Let us take the case of the *Lusitania* which was sunk off the coast of Ireland on the 7th day of May 1915.

This was an English liner, with more than 1,250 passengers aboard, 129 of whom were American citizens. It sailed from New York, and was destined for Liverpool. In addition to its passenger list and a miscellaneous assortment of freight, it carried a cargo of small-rifle ammunition intended for the Allies.

There was no law forbidding the shipment of arms from the United States, or preventing Americans from traveling into or through danger zones or to belligerent countries or on the vessels of belligerents. On the contrary, international law sanctioned these things, and our Government relied and insisted on these rights for ours and all neutral nations.

Under the present law, and under the embargo which has been issued under it, would the *Lusitania* have been sunk? And, if sunk, would it have carried down with it 124 American citizens—men, women, and children?

The only difference between that ship's status as it sailed and its status under the present law is that it would not have carried the 4,200 cases of small rifle ammunition afterward discovered to have been aboard. It would have carried the 129 American passengers on board. It would have been sunk. The 124 Americans would have been murdered, in violation of the law of nations, under the present law and under the embargo which is now in force. The American people would have been aroused just as they were aroused. The American Government would have protested just as it did protest. We would have been drawn toward the brink of war just as we were drawn, and many Americans would have clamored for war against Germany just as they did clamor for it then.

Could these things have happened under the measure we are now proposing? The answer is emphatically "No."

The *Lusitania* might have carried the small rifle ammunition which it carried, provided the title to it had been transferred to the foreign purchaser and no American citizen had any interest whatever in it. But under the proposed measure not one of the 129 Americans aboard this ship would have sailed on it, not an American would have lost his life, and not a note of protest on the subject would have passed between President Wilson and the Imperial German Government.

In other words, the whole controversy over the sinking of the *Lusitania* would have been completely avoided under the law we now propose. There would have been no such incident so far as our Government was concerned.

Under this state of facts, how would the present law keep us out of war, and how could the law we propose become the first, the second, or any other step toward war?

Let us take the case of the *Gulflight*.

This was an American ship. It flew the American flag. It was manned by an American crew. It carried not arms, ammunition, and implements of war, but a cargo of oil, which is not and cannot be prescribed under the sacred

embargo now in force, or under any embargo which can be issued under the present law.

While the *Gulflight* was not sunk, it was attacked by a German submarine and three American citizens lost their lives as the result of the attack.

The torpedoing of this ship brought on another protest from our Government and another long diplomatic controversy between it and the German Government.

Under the present law and the embargo now in force, or any embargo possible under the present law, would the *Gulflight* incident have been avoided? Every Senator here knows that it would not have been avoided.

If on May 1, 1915, or the date on which this vessel sailed from an American port, the present law had been in force and the present embargo had been in effect, the *Gulflight*, or any American ship by any other name, could have sailed out of New York or any other American port with a cargo of oil, without violating any law or any proclamation then or now possible, and would have been sunk or subject to attack by the same German submarine which attacked it on that day.

Could this have occurred under the law we are now proposing? Could the *Gulflight* have sailed from any American port loaded with a cargo of oil destined for a belligerent in the World War? Could it sail today, if the law we now propose should be enacted, from any American port, carrying oil to any port of a belligerent nation?

Every Senator knows that it could not only not have sailed with such a cargo, but could not have sailed at all, with or without a cargo, destined for a belligerent country.

Therefore, while the *Gulflight* could and did sail under the law as it existed in 1915, and could have sailed and could sail now under the present law and the present embargo, it could not have sailed then and could not sail now under the law which we are asking the Senate to adopt and which we hope the Congress of the United States will adopt.

Hence, the present law and the present embargo, and any embargo the President can now impose, are not a guaranty against our involvement in war, and the proposed law which we are supporting is not the first, the second, or any other step toward war. It is a step away from the probability of war, and therefore a step toward peace.

On May 25, 1915, came the torpedoing of the American vessels, *Nebraska* and *Leelanaw*.

On August 4, 1915, *The Pass of Bahamas* surrendered to a German attack.

On October 28, 1916, the *Lanao* was sunk.

On November 7, 1916, the *Columbian* was another victim.

On November 26, the *Chemung* was torpedoed by an Austrian submarine.

On December 14, the *Rebecca Palmer* was torpedoed.

On January 4, 1917, the *Norlina* was sunk, and

On February 3, 1917, the *Housatonic* was sunk.

Of these 11 American vessels attacked 6 were sunk, 1 surrendered, and 4 were damaged. Only three American lives were lost, it is true, but this was not the fault of those responsible for the attacks.

On February 12, 1917, the *Lyman M. Law* was captured.

On March 12, 1917, the *Algonquin* was shelled and bombed.

On March 16, 1917, the *Vigilancia* was torpedoed with a loss of 15 lives, 6 of whom were Americans.

On March 17, 1917, the *City of Memphis* was shelled.

On March 18, 1917, the *Illinois* was bombed.

On March 21, 1917, the *Healdton* was torpedoed with a loss of 21 lives, of whom 7 were Americans.

On April 1, 1917, the *Aztec* was torpedoed with a loss of 28 lives, 12 of whom were Americans.

On April 4, 1917, the *Marguerite* was bombed; and

On April 4, 1917, the same day, the American ship, *Missourian*, was shelled by the Germany Navy.

Of these 20 ships, flying the American flag, engaged in a business universally recognized to be lawful then, 15 were sunk, 4 were damaged, and 1 surrendered; and a total of 28 American lives were destroyed.

The list of 20 does not include a number of other American ships which were fired on by the German or Austrian naval

forces; and it does not include American lives lost in the sinking of the French steamer *Sussex*, and other vessels not flying the American flag.

As a result of these outrages upon our commerce—and this is the crux of the situation, and is what we are seeking to avoid—as a result of these outrages upon our commerce and the lives of our people, the Government of the United States became more insistent upon the observance of the forms of civilized warfare, and the people of the United States became constantly more aroused.

President Wilson had been reinaugurated on the 4th of March, amid scenes of solemnity widely in contrast to the gala day which witnessed his first inauguration. But on that same night a wildly enthusiastic mob was pouring into Carnegie Hall in New York to denounce those Members of the Senate who had opposed and defeated the measure permitting the arming of American merchant vessels in their own defense. The Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott, an outstanding minister, was greeted with enthusiasm when he denounced them as traitors.

James M. Beck, later to become Solicitor General of the United States, and still later a Member of the House of Representatives, contended that, regardless of Congress, the President had a right to arm American merchant vessels in their own defense.

Theodore Roosevelt was denouncing President Wilson for his patience and forbearance and attributing it to cowardice, and stated that "If he does not go to war with Germany I shall skin him alive." And in the churches of New York and other cities men of the cloth like Dr. Newell Dwight Hillis and Dr. Charles A. Eaton, now a Member of Congress, were thundering against the German outrages, and demanding the acceptance of war as the only honorable alternative.

Why were these things transpiring? Why were our people aroused? Why were 158 resolutions adopted in as many churches on a single Sunday condemning the things of which I have been speaking and demanding that our Government take steps to redress these grievances?

Because one of the belligerents in the European war was engaged in ruthless warfare against our commerce and our citizens and the rights which they had enjoyed for more than a century.

Why have I recalled these incidents, these sinkings of American ships, the taking of American lives, and arousement of the American people because of them?

Because, notwithstanding its defenders contend that the present law and the present embargo will keep us out of war, these same sinkings of vessels, these same takings of American lives, or most of them, and the consequent arousal of the American people against the belligerent nation perpetrating them, could have occurred then under the present law and this embargo, and can occur under them now.

The law which we are now proposing would have prevented these attacks upon, and losses of, property and lives, because both property and lives would have been withheld from the regions of danger resulting in their destruction or attack on them. The law we are proposing will keep American ships and American cargoes and American sailors and American travelers out of present regions of danger.

Even the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Nye] during his address in this body the other day, in response to questions which I propounded to him, confessed that the measure we are asking the Senate to adopt goes much further in keeping our ships and our people and our cargoes out of the war zones than the present law or any proclamation or embargo the President can issue under it.

All other Senators must confess the same truth, because it is incontrovertible.

Therefore, Mr. President, the present law, and the only embargoes that can be issued under it, are not a guaranty against our involvement in war; and the law we propose, for reasons which must now be self-evident, is not the first or any other step toward war. For under the present law it is conceivably almost as easy for us to become involved as it was in 1917, while under the law we propose none of the things could occur which actually drew us into the war in 1917.



In lieu of a mere embargo on the sale of arms, which is not what forced us into the war 22 years ago, we propose to place an embargo against the type and destiny and means of commerce and travel which did force us into war 22 years ago.

Between the two, it seems to me, there ought to be but one choice among those who think the problem through and follow the logic of the inevitable conclusion which they must reach.

But those who have been driven by the logic of events and of facts to see and acknowledge the more effective method which we offer for avoiding involvement in foreign wars now propose that both methods be used, namely, that the embargo be kept and that there be added to it the other provisions of the new measure now before us.

This is a sort of deathbed confession; but the adoption of the suggestion would make a patchwork of the legislation and remove the consistent and harmonious manner in which we attempt to deal with all commerce with belligerent nations.

Mr. President, under the measure now before the Senate there will be no necessity for an embargo on arms or any other commodity in order that we may avoid war.

Whether it be wheat, or corn, or tobacco, or shoes, or typewriters, or tanks, or toothbrushes, or airplanes, or guns, or powder, or underwear, or automobiles, or office furniture, or honey, or oatmeal, or checkerboards, or billiards, or golf balls, or books, or anything that can be recalled by the mind of man, it cannot be shipped to a belligerent nation or through a danger zone anywhere in the world in an American ship.

No American ship, nor its crew, can therefore be within the range of destruction contemplated by the kind of sea warfare which occurred in the World War or is likely to occur in this one.

No category of arms, ammunition, or implements of war can be carried in our own ships under any condition, and cannot be carried in foreign ships until all title and interest in them have been transferred to the foreign purchaser.

Therefore, if a cargo of such materials and the crew or passengers on such foreign ship should be destroyed, there would be no occasion for our Government to protest or take official notice of it, and there would be no occasion or cause for us to become involved.

This proposition no one can deny.

Therefore there is no more need for an embargo on arms than for an embargo on wheat, or sewer pipes, or umbrellas.

This measure is consistent and sufficient, because it puts all commerce with belligerents on the basis of equality, and withholds it altogether so far as our ships are concerned.

It is not likely that the American people will become excited or that our Government would become active or interested over the sinking of a foreign vessel containing no American citizen or an article of commerce owned by an American, no matter what the origin of the cargo.

But the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]—for whom, as he knows, I entertain the highest personal regard—asserts that if we become an arsenal for one belligerent we will become the target of another.

This is an attractive catch phrase, but it is only a figure of speech.

We cannot become the target of a nation even for engaging in unlawful commerce unless we are within the range of its operations; and certainly we cannot become the target of any nation for merely engaging in a lawful business when we withhold ourselves from the range of its operations.

But the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]—for whom we all entertain the deepest affection and respect—told us the other day in his eloquent and unquestionably sincere address to the Senate that if we lift the embargo and permit even foreign vessels to come here and obtain arms intended for one of the belligerents, Hitler will come or send his agents here and destroy the factories in which arms are being manufactured.

This seems to me to be a fantastic resort to the imagination. Such an act on the part of any foreign government would constitute an attack upon the sovereignty of the United States, and would be a violation of our domestic laws, for

the punishment of which we have adequate machinery; and for us to refuse to regulate or control our domestic conduct as seems to us wise and proper out of fear that some foreign ruler would sabotage our industries would brand us as cowards, indeed.

It would be as logical to say they would destroy our wheat fields or poison our livestock because bread and meat might find their way to England or France.

This prophecy of the Senator is based on no sound foundation. It has not been long since I heard the Senator from Idaho vehemently prophesy that there would be no war in Europe this year—1939.

Much as I admire and respect the intellect and the character of the Senator from Idaho, I am afraid he will be compelled to reestablish my faith in him as an infallible prophet before I can accept his prediction that Hitler or any belligerent will blow up our factories and destroy our industries because they produce articles which both his enemies and he can obtain if they will come for them and take them away.

But we are told that even if the lifting of the embargo would not involve us in war, it ought to be retained on moral grounds, because the sale of arms designed for or capable of destruction of human life is immoral and ought to be suppressed.

This phase of the subject involves a discussion of the metaphysical and ethical ramifications of what is right and what is wrong, what is just or unjust, what is righteous or unrighteous in the conduct of men toward one another in all circumstances and conditions of life.

It might be said that the production of any agency with which human life may be destroyed or tortured is immoral, unethical, or unjust, no matter how beneficial its normal use may be to the human race. Thus, the production of axes, or hammers, or tools of various kinds might be said to be immoral, because in some exigency of human conduct they might be used for the destruction of human life.

It might be said that the production of shotguns or pistols is immoral, because, although they may be designed for the sport of the hunter, they may be capable of use in the destruction of human life, and therefore their manufacture or sale is immoral, unethical, and unjust, wicked, and unrighteous, and ought to be prohibited.

It might be said that the manufacture and sale of poisons of all kinds is immoral and wicked and ought to be suppressed, because these articles are capable of use, and are frequently used, for the destruction of human life.

Where can we draw the line between the moral and the immoral, the just and the unjust, the ethical and the unethical, the virtuous and the vicious, in the production of instruments with which human life may be taken or made to suffer?

If we lived in a world where all men acknowledged the rights of all other men, where all nations acknowledged and respected the rights of all other nations, and where the necessity never arose for men or groups of men to contest with other men or groups of men for the enjoyment of their natural or acquired rights, we might moralize upon the immorality or the futility or the stupidity of all instruments of defense where no defense is needed.

When does it become immoral or unethical or unjust or wicked to produce for ourselves or for others the instruments through which human rights may be enforced, and human slavery or human shackles or degradation thrown off, and the right to stand forth as free men obtained and maintained?

Was it immoral for any one outside the contestants themselves, or for the contestants themselves, to produce the instruments by which the revolutions in Germany and France and Italy during the last century were carried on?

Was it immoral for the nations of Europe to produce or obtain wherever they could the instruments of war in their struggles against the boundless ambitions of Napoleon?

Would it have been immoral for any nation or people to have produced and made available the implements of self-defense for the Armenians in their unequal struggle with the Turks?

Was it immoral for any nation in the world to produce and make available to both sides in our War between the States the arms and ammunition and implements with which each side was fighting what it regarded as a righteous war?

Would it have been immoral or unethical or wicked for France or any other nation to have produced and made available to the American Colonies during the Revolutionary War such instruments of warfare as they needed to obtain in order that the light of liberty might be kindled upon the hilltops of America, and the great Republic which we seek to serve started upon its matchless history?

Was it, or would it have been, immoral or wicked or unjust for us in the United States to produce and make available to the struggling and defenseless people of Cuba the means of her defense and her liberation from the tyranny of Spain in 1898?

If the Dominion of Canada, or any of the 20 republics of the Western Hemisphere, should be attacked and threatened with subjugation by some European or Asiatic power, would it be immoral or unjust or unethical or wicked or diabolical for the United States to permit the manufacture or sale of the instruments of their preservation and defense?

When does a cannon, a tank, an airplane, a rifle, or the ammunition to make them effective, become immoral or wicked; and when do they assume the character and attributes of morality and ethics and righteousness?

These questions cannot be resolved or settled in the realms of abstract philosophical discussion, for we must take the human race as we find it and not as we might think we should like to make it. In all history there have been imponderable emotional and spiritual equations which have sanctified sacrifice and glorified the endurance of hardship rather than surrender to the evils against which men battled.

Peter the Hermit preached the Crusades not to sack the Holy City but to rescue the Holy Sepulcher.

If it be immoral to sell arms to anybody anywhere under any circumstances, it is equally immoral to purchase them, if not more so, because the ultimate purchaser in all probability will use them for the purpose for which he wants or needs them.

If the United States were a weak nation, and defenseless against the encroachment of some mighty aggressor, would it occur to any Senator or to any American that it would be wicked and immoral and unjust and diabolical for us to purchase the means of our defense, or for the people of any other nation to sell them to us? We know that the answer to this question would be a universal "No."

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, and in the light of our own history, it does not now lie in our mouths to issue the pharisaical announcement that we have suddenly become so strong and so upright and so moral and so uncontaminated by the sordid history of less worthy peoples that we cannot in good conscience permit them to do what we ourselves have done and would again do in the hour of our desperation, if the time and need should ever arise.

In considering the step which we ask you to take and hope you will take, I have sought to brush aside all questions of individual partiality or preference among the belligerents in the present war or in any war. I have sought to abandon and, if possible, to forget my own inherent reactions to injustice and brutality wherever they may be found on the face of the earth. I realize how difficult, if not impossible, it is for men and women who have ideals of personal or national conduct to divest themselves wholly of the reactions which register in their hearts at misconduct or injustice perpetrated by one great nation against another, by one race against another, or by one religion against another. I realize that men and women of delicate and refined sensibilities must recoil at mass murder and mass injustice and mass brutality anywhere in the world.

But as a Senator, charged with the duty of representing and protecting our own people insofar as it lies within my power, I have no right to be swayed by any motive except

the preservation of the integrity and welfare of our own Nation as I see it in the light that God has given me in the attempt to perform that duty and that service. I have the right, though—yea, I have the obligation—to scan the far horizon of this Nation's future to determine the result of my actions now. I have the right no less than the obligation to consider what sort of nation I am helping to bequeath to my children and their children, and theirs again for a hundred or a thousand years.

I have lived most of my life. I have registered threescore years since the date of my birth, and in all likelihood another score or two is all that I can hope for in this world. I am thinking of my children, their children, and their children's children. I am thinking of your children and all the millions of people who live in America and look to us at this time to protect and preserve them and their interests.

I am not unmindful of the obligation to try to visualize what sort of world we are helping to create and pass on to those who will be our successors in all the relations of life in the years and centuries to come.

I want no war. God forbid that I should pursue here a course which will bring a needless hazard to my own flesh and blood, or to the flesh and blood of any colleague of mine in the Senate, or the flesh and blood of any of my fellow citizens throughout this Nation.

I have seen war. I voted for our entry into the last war. I pray that I may never again be called on to cast such a vote. It was a cup from which I do not wish again to drink. I saw that war, not as a soldier but as a public servant interested in the manner of its prosecution and the speed of its termination.

I saw it in the front-line trenches. I saw it in the desolation of "no man's land." I saw it in the anguish of hospitals behind the lines. I saw it at the graves of relatives and friends who gave up youth and hope and life itself in behalf of a great ideal. For more than 20 years I have seen it in the shattered limbs and minds of many who survived the ordeal, and I have seen it in the chaos and confusion of economic and moral infirmities which have resulted from it.

I want no war. And because I want no war I am supporting and propose to vote for a measure which involves the greatest sacrifice ever made by any nation in the history of mankind in order to avoid war. I support this measure, not because we are weak or supine or cowardly. We are not weak; we are not supine; we are not cowards. I support it because we are strong and unafraid and wish to conserve that strength and that courage for the service of the democratic ideal which we have built up and which we cherish, not only for ourselves in America but throughout the world.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I have listened attentively to and been impressed by the sincerity of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] in his moving address, yet I should like to make a simple observation which has occurred to me.

It is noted that neither belligerent in the present European war has yet bombed civilian populations. I am convinced that both belligerents, among other considerations, know that so long as America remains strictly neutral, whichever one first resorts to this atrocious form of warfare will immediately inflame America, and cause America to sympathize with, and possibly aid, the victim.

Therefore it seems to me that by remaining strictly neutral we are performing a great humanitarian service—the great service of protecting the defenseless civilian populations in war-torn Europe—whereas, if we become unneutral, we shall lose this beneficent influence.

I favor the retention of the present neutrality law rather than to change it for the worse in a bad situation.

#### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, October 20, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.